

in this office under an appointment which expired March 12, 1942.

John White Stuart, of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia. Mr. Stuart is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 21, 1942.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Austin S. Imirie to be a principal administrative officer in national headquarters, Selective Service System. The compensation to be paid Mr. Imirie will be \$5,600 per annum.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 13 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Charles I. Lafferty to be comptroller of customs with headquarters at Philadelphia, Pa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 13, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art worthy of more than our deepest love, our highest praise, and our purest devotion, we pray that it may be the goal of our aspirations and desires to be one with Thee in Thine Eternal Spirit and Will.

Grant that our spirits may always beat time to that which is noble, just, and righteous. Give us honesty of mind and humanity of heart. Purge us of all selfishness and self-interest.

We pray that in the conflict in which we are now engaged we may know how to mobilize the sinews of the soul and gird ourselves with fortitude, fidelity, and faith. Give unto those who are on the battle front and the home front courage and calmness, enabling them to carry on without fear and without faltering.

When we are tempted to become discouraged and disheartened, may we have a vision that sees beyond tragedy, assured that the future belongs to God and that out of all the strife and struggles there will come that which is curative and creative for the welfare of mankind and the building of a better world.

Hear us in the name of our risen Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 9, 1942, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6495. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.

REPUBLICAN RIVER COMPACT

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the

veto message on the bill (H. R. 5945) granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River Basin, coming over from April 2, 1942.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and the message be referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

The motion was agreed to.

LONGEVITY PAY FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The SPEAKER. The next unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message on the bill (H. R. 1057) to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees, coming over from April 2, 1942.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and the message be referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

The motion was agreed to.

HARRY KAHN

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is the consideration of the veto message on the bill (H. R. 4665) for the relief of Harry Kahn, coming over from April 9, 1942.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on Claims.

There was no objection.

H. J. ABNEY

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is the consideration of the veto message on the bill (H. R. 5504) for the relief of H. J. Abney, coming over from April 9, 1942.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on Claims.

There was no objection.

FORTIFICATION OF WINES

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5802) to amend certain provisions of law relative to the withdrawal of brandy for fortification of wines and production of wines, brandy, and fruit spirits so as to remove therefrom certain unnecessary restrictions, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, we should like to hear what the report is.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California has called up a conference report, and asks unanimous consent that the statement of the conferees be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5802) to amend certain provisions of law

relative to the withdrawal of brandy for fortification of wines and production of wines, brandy, and fruit spirits so as to remove therefrom certain unnecessary restrictions, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
FRANK H. BUCK,
FRANK CROWTHER,

Managers on the part of the House.

WALTER F. GFORGE,
DAVID I. WALSH,
TOM CONNALLY,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5802) to amend certain provisions of law relative to the withdrawal of brandy for fortification of wines and production of wines, brandy, and fruit spirits so as to remove therefrom certain unnecessary restrictions, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The first Senate amendment provided that the maximum penal sum of any bond required for any bonded winery or bonded storeroom shall be \$50,000. Existing law requires that the wine producer's bond should be sufficient to fully cover at all times the payment of internal-revenue taxes due to be paid by him. The Senate amendment merely establishes a maximum of \$50,000 with respect to any one wine producer. The House recedes.

The second Senate amendment amends the Federal Alcohol Administration Act to prohibit statements of alcoholic content of wines in any advertisement by radio, newspaper, periodical, or other publication, or by any sign or outdoor advertisement or any other printed or graphic matter. The House recedes.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
FRANK H. BUCK,
FRANK CROWTHER,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, the amendments propose to do only two things, both of which are approved by the Treasury Department. The conference report has already been adopted by the other body. The Committee on Ways and Means has considered the matter and is unanimous in its opinion that these amendments should be agreed to. In fact, one of them appeared in its original form, the \$50,000 allotment in the bill, as introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. Izac), but by an error it was not incorporated in the final draft as passed by the House. There has been no change in the House bill. There is only the addition of two matters.

The second amendment provides only that advertising of sweet wines—that is, those from 14 to 20 percent—must follow the same rules and regulations as wines under 14 percent. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania desires to go down to Magruder's or the Connecticut Avenue Wine & Liquor Store, or anywhere else, and buy wine, he will still see printed on the label the amount of alcoholic content in those wines; but what we are trying to do is to adopt a uniform rule as far as advertising is concerned—public displays,

open-air advertising, radio, and so forth—so that nobody will go into a particular store under the impression that he is getting there a greater alcoholic content than he would somewhere else.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. As I understand the amendment that was added by the Senate, in which the gentleman desires the concurrence of the House, the alcoholic content of wines containing more than 14 percent of alcohol does not have to be listed in advertisements. Is that correct?

Mr. BUCK. They may not be hereafter advertised as containing such and such an amount of alcohol. I may say to the gentleman that there has been a great deal of objection from our southern colleagues because they felt that the advertising of sherry as having a 20 percent alcoholic content was increasing the trade there to the detriment of the population and of auto drivers. Let us cut that out. Let us be somewhat of a prohibitionist in our views for once in our lives.

Mr. RICH. I never bought any wine and I never bought any liquor of any kind and I am speaking from that standpoint, which I presume the gentleman will realize.

Mr. BUCK. The only time I ever saw the gentleman in possession of any wine or any liquor was when he waved a bottle of Puerto Rican rum here in the House.

Mr. RICH. I will say to the gentleman that that was given to me by the Secretary of the Interior and by the Virgin Islands Rum Co. who have got everybody in this country into the rum business. I am against having the Government in the rum business and that was the reason I waved that bottle of wine or rum here. I wanted the people to know that they are already in the rum business.

Now, let us get to the matter of the alcoholic content of wine. We have the Pure Food and Drugs Act, which requires that the alcoholic content of everything that the people of this country consume shall be shown on the label.

Mr. BUCK. Pardon me, let me correct the gentleman. Both the labeling section and the advertising section are contained in section 205 of title XXVII of the United States Code. Let me say that while they are in different subdivisions, this provision that the Senate adopted does not in any manner permit the erasure of the statement on the bottle saying it is 9-percent alcohol, or 14 percent, 18 percent, or 20 percent, whatever it is. This provision will prohibit something being put on the billboard or prevent someone going on the radio somewhere and saying, "Come to our wine store because we have the highest percentage-of-alcohol wine there is," no matter whether it is high-grade wine or not. It seems to me that when those representing wine districts on the Ways and Means Committee and those representing dry districts can agree on a proposition of this kind it ill behooves anybody to get up here and say that this is not for the welfare of the country.

Mr. RICH. If it is for the welfare of the country, then I am for it, but I just doubt that if you were going to permit advertisements to go out without telling the people of this country that the wine contains 20 or 25 percent of alcohol. And because they buy that wine and they get lots of kick out of it, then they think they are doing something good for themselves, when they are only pickling their bodies by drinking the damned stuff. It is about time we did something to prevent that kind of advertising. I do not think it is good for the American people to be pickled with alcohol, and I tell you right now if there ever was a time when the American people ought to retain their wits and cultivate sound bodies that time is now, especially if we are going to get on with this war. I am for doing those things that are going to be for the best interests of American manhood and American womanhood, and I do not want to see the boys and girls of this country pickled in alcohol, and I do not think we ought to have legislation that is going to have any such effect. That is my honest belief.

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman is arguing for the purpose of the amendment, and for the benefit of the other Members of the House, I will read what John L. Sullivan, Acting Secretary of the Treasury, said about the amendment:

This Department is of the opinion that this proposed amendment will have a good effect because it will exclude from the advertising media mentioned the references to the alcoholic content of the product advertised. It is entirely consistent with the position the Department has taken in respect of the advertising of fortified wines. There the Department's position has been that the advertisers of wines shall not use the word "fortified" in connection with their advertisements because the word "fortified" indicates the strengthening of a normal wine by the addition of distilled spirits. Indeed, the effect produced by the departmental ban on the use of the word "fortified" in connection with the advertising of wines is to some extent nullified by the statements of alcoholic content of wines as required by the law.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. No; I have moved the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE J. ADAM BEDE

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce at this time the passing of J. Adam Bede, a former Member of the House. Mr. Bede's home was in Duluth, Minn., and he passed away on Saturday, April 11. He was 86 years of age.

Mr. Bede served three terms in Congress. He was first elected in 1902 and was reelected to the Fifty-ninth and Sixtieth Congresses. His death removes

one of the great characters of America. He had no superior on the public platform and his reputation as a humorist was of the highest order. Always a student of the affairs of government, Mr. Bede ranked as an expert in the field of transportation problems.

He served on the Rivers and Harbors Committee when he was a Member of the House and his interest in that subject continued to the time of his death. He was one of the leading exponents of the St. Lawrence seaway project, and many of you will recall your pleasant visits with him when he attended committee meetings of the Rivers and Harbors Committee last fall.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I concur in everything that my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTINGER] said with reference to our departed friend, J. Adam Bede, of Duluth. Mr. Bede served in this body from 1902 until 1906. He was a very kindly man, able and dependable. I have never heard J. Adam Bede say anything but good of anyone. He had a host of friends, not alone in Minnesota but here in the Nation's Capital, all of whom admired him for his intellectual honesty, his cordial fellowship, and his ability. Mr. Bede was easily one of the biggest men of his time, at the turn of the century, when he was a Member of this body; and in common with thousands and thousands in Minnesota, I mourn his death. I am glad to have this opportunity to say a few words of tribute to his memory, which will long live.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I learned of the passing of J. Adam Bede as just announced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTINGER]. I join with my colleagues from Minnesota in the tribute they have paid to him.

Mr. Bede was first elected to serve in the Fifty-eighth Congress and was reelected to the Fifty-ninth and Sixtieth Congresses. He was born in Lorain County, Ohio, in 1856. After learning the printer's trade he taught school and was engaged in newspaper work. He supported Grover Cleveland in 1888 and 1892; was appointed United States Marshal for the District of Minnesota in 1894 and served through the great railroad strikes of that year. He returned to the Republican Party on the financial issue in 1896 and campaigned in several States that year. He was nominated and elected as a Republican to the House of Representatives.

He had a national reputation as an orator and as a student of affairs of government. He had friends throughout the country and was ever interested in the development of the great Northwest. Shortly before his death he spent considerable time in Washington in the interest of the development of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. Bede was of a most friendly and kindly disposition; I have never known

him to say anything that was harsh or unkind about anyone.

His fame as an orator and statesman will live with the years. The great Northwest has lost one of its able advocates and thousands of us in Minnesota have lost a true friend.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to join in the tribute paid the memory of J. Adam Bede by my colleagues from Minnesota, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. KNUTSON, and Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Bede will live long in the thoughts of the people of our State and his friends will cherish for years to come his great kindness of character. A month ago I had the pleasure of discussing with him the seaway, and I only regret he did not live long enough to see his dream come true.

MR. EUGENE MEYER

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have publicly applauded Mr. Eugene Meyer. Not one word of praise have I ever spoken of him would I change, because he is a man of extraordinary ability. However, I regret that he has seen fit to accuse Secretary Jesse Jones of dereliction of duty or lack of foresight. It so happens that Mr. Jones' position is so firmly fixed in the public esteem that the people of this country are not going to permit criticism to rivet him to the rocks because of a too great loyalty to his chief, whose greatest fault history will probably say is too great a love for all mankind. Mr. Speaker, this is no time to look for a scapegoat. If there be sin, it is the sin of all. Prior to Pearl Harbor preparation for war proceeded as rapidly as public sentiment would permit. This is a time for unity, for concord, and for common action.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article on the menhaden fisheries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests: I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a very splendid article by a former Member of this House, Mr. Samuel B. Pettengill, on A Time When Men Grow Tall.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of a newspaper article and an editorial from the Benton Harbor News Palladium.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I request indefinite leave of absence for my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey

[Mr. POWERS] on account of serious illness in his family.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AUTOMOBILE DEALERS AND THE FINANCE COMPANIES

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, there is a matter I want to call to your attention, and I am sure that within the next few days it will come to your attention. The Government has issued an order freezing the sale of automobiles, and the finance companies of the country are taking advantage of that order, and in the State of Florida are demanding that payments be made far beyond what the dealers are able to pay and telling them that unless they make those payments they will take over, that they are liquidating their finance companies. We do not want to see these finance companies destroy these automobile dealers. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has some authority to loan them, but not enough, and I am introducing a bill today which I hope every Member of the House will study, for the protection of these automobile dealers. I am sure that they are willing to make every sacrifice necessary, and we should not be willing to sacrifice them to the finance companies. I have evidence that these finance companies are taking advantage of this situation to enrich themselves and will be glad to submit it to anyone who is interested at the proper time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a radio address made by me.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Binghamton Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a resolution passed unanimously by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an editorial from the Sheboygan Press of April 9.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of April 11.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of today's business and any other

special orders that I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for permission to address the House for 10 minutes today at the conclusion of any other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the day's calendar and all other business on the Speaker's table I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TAXES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House the fact that the Treasury statement of April 9 shows we have gone in the red about a billion and a third dollars per month during this year. A billion and a third dollars a month. In 9 months we have gone in the red about \$12,000,000,000.

Last fall the President of the United States said we should have increased taxes; that we should raise eight or nine billion dollars more by taxation to keep our Treasury in better position. I thought the Ways and Means Committee would bring a tax bill in here about December so that it would begin to operate some time in January. But 3 months of this year have gone. We have not received the tax bill. If we do not get a tax bill, bankruptcy is confronting us. How can you win a war with a bankrupt treasury? If the people of this country do not realize soon that they have to pay for the war and pay for the extravagances of this administration and keep the Treasury nearer in balance, we will go into bankruptcy, and then it will be terrible. We have to increase our taxes if we are going to win the war. Procrastination is dangerous. You have been running in the red for 12 years. The Treasury is depleted; the country is in danger. Everybody must pay to the limit of his ability if we are to be a stable government. You cannot operate a navy or army and air corps with a bankrupt nation. A word to the wise is sufficient. [Here the gavel fell.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I request 3 days leave of absence for my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS] on account of important official business.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE CHURCH STILL FREE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, from Norway the best news a free people can offer the world has come through to America; 1,100 clergymen resigned in protest against the efforts of Norway's Quisling to Nazify the Norwegian church. Half a dozen of the nation's leading bishops have already been placed in concentration camps, and they are certain to be joined by hundreds more before light replaces darkness throughout Europe.

To those who have accused the church of vacillation and lack of leadership in these trying days, the example of such men as Niemöller in Germany and Berggrav in Norway should come as a stirring answer. Freedom will never be crushed so long as men are willing to give up their lives that it may live.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter addressed to George P. Sheridan, Director of the National Youth Administration in the State of Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix, and to include a letter addressed to me and my reply to the same.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include some short resolutions adopted by the city of Portland on the Japanese question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an excerpt from the Jersey Bulletin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE J. ADAM BEDE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the late J. Adam Bede was a friend of my father. I am constrained on that account not to be silent as I learn of his death.

That what I say does not run into a long lot of words is not to be taken as a measure of the respect I desire to show the memory of my father's friend.

Mr. Bede was a member of the Fifty-eighth to Sixtieth Congresses. During his service in Congress he made many friends and made an indelible impression on those with whom he was associated for all time.

A man of more than ordinary ability, fearless and fair, he was deserving of the

genuine regard and respect of political friend and foe alike, and was so accredited.

I knew him in days gone by, and was more than pleased to renew the acquaintance and friendship during the last year when and while he was actively engaged in an effort to further the interests of the St. Lawrence River project, to which he knew I was unalterably opposed, as of the present.

I listened to his arguments, he knowing that I did not agree with either his premise or his conclusions. I told him just what I thought about the proposition, with which he unalterably disagreed.

These friendly controversial colloquies never raised a ripple of discord to disturb the friendly relations between us.

The more I saw of him the better I liked him and the more genuinely I respected him.

I am sorry to learn of his passing. Minnesota has lost one of its very able citizens and the country a man whose integrity was unquestioned, whose ability was far above the average, whose enthusiasm for and whose belief in those things for which he stood was as unlimited and as unchangeable as the mountains round about Jerusalem. We need and can ill afford to lose such men as J. Adam Bede.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the legislative business of the day has been disposed of and other special orders, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to insert therein a statement I made before the Committee on Public Lands.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from an article in PM of Friday, April 10, 1942, captioned "Probe due on HOFFMAN," the following is quoted:

HOFFMAN is wanted for questioning by the Federal grand jury that already has indicted George Sylvester Vierick, Nazi propagandist; George Hill, FISH's former secretary-clerk; and several others for helping spread the gospel according to Hitler in the United States of America.

Farther down in the article is this sentence, which refers to two talks made on the floor of the House, one on January 27, the other on January 30, in the following language:

The Hoffman speech was titled "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes, or Roosevelt Is a Judas."

That statement is a deliberate falsehood, for the two speeches were entitled "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes," and no reference to Roosevelt as a Judas was contained therein.

In the Detroit News, under date of April 10, is found this statement:

HOFFMAN, bitterly outspoken isolationist from Allegan, has, grand-jury investigators assert, either consciously or otherwise, let his speeches in the House of Representatives be used as part of an anti-Roosevelt, anti-British, anti-Jewish campaign, which, the investigators declare, is clearly subversive.

The foregoing statement is wholly false, for the speeches referred to, being those of January 27 and January 30, are speeches made in opposition to the effort of certain anti-Americans to cause us to surrender our independence, adopt a declaration of interdependence, become a part of a United States of the World, and lose our national identity.

The Detroit News article of April 10 contained this further statement:

Circulation of HOFFMAN's speeches was one of the activities of George Sylvester Vierick, recently convicted Nazi master spy, according to preliminary grand-jury developments last week. It developed late Thursday that HOFFMAN had supplied reprints of his "Roosevelt Is a Judas" speech to an anti-British editor in Omaha, Nebr.

That charge is false, insofar as it refers to my talks made on the floor of the House as a "Roosevelt Is a Judas" speech. Nor did Vierick, whom I do not know, ever, to my knowledge, circulate any speech made by me. Moreover, speeches made on the House floor can be purchased of the Government printer by anyone securing copies of the RECORD. Even Maloney might quote the Bible to justify his smear campaign, but that would not give him an air of sanctity.

The newspaper comments quoted above call in question my loyalty, my patriotism, my integrity, and raise a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair feels that the first statement read, to wit—

HOFFMAN is wanted for questioning by the Federal grand jury that already has indicted George Sylvester Vierick, Nazi propagandist; George Hill, FISH's former secretary-clerk; and several others for helping spread the gospel according to Hitler in the United States of America—

constitutes a question of personal privilege.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a propaganda sheet put out by the World Fellowship, Inc.; and two full-page ads, one from the Washington Star of January 5, and the other from the New York Times of December 18, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Permit me to preface my remarks by calling attention to the fact that under the law grand-jury proceedings are supposed to be secret; that no witness called before the grand jury is permitted to divulge the substance of his

testimony. Nor is anyone, special prosecutor, grand-jury foreman, member of the grand jury, or court attendant guarding the deliberations of a grand jury, permitted, under the law, to disclose any of the proceedings of the grand jury.

Notwithstanding this strict rule of law, the purpose of which is to prevent those whose activities are being investigated from learning what is being done, it is apparent that the spirit, if not the letter, of the law is being violated by the investigators employed either by Special Attorney Maloney or the grand jury itself.

Much information has been given to the public through the press by those purporting to be acting for the grand jury. Note this statement from the Detroit News:

Circulation of HOFFMAN's speeches was one of the activities of George Sylvester Vierick, recently convicted Nazi master spy, according to preliminary grand-jury developments last week.

Just when and why did special grand-jury investigators disclose to the public press matters under investigation by the grand jury? Those who have read the Washington Post have noted with amazement the disclosure by that paper of grand-jury testimony. It would seem as though the Post's reporter had access to transcripts of the testimony. That should not be.

I suggest that the Speaker of the House appoint a committee to call before it the special attorney, Maloney, reporters for the Post, and the grand-jury investigators, and ascertain whether or not the present investigation is not being conducted as a smear campaign in an effort to defeat all those who, prior to December 7, might be considered as isolationists; that such a committee inquire as to whether or not the special attorney himself did not, when seeking an extension of the life of the grand jury, make the statement that, if he was given 3 additional months, he could defeat every Republican candidate for Congress who had been opposed to our entry into war.

I also suggest that the committee investigate and determine whether the proceedings of the grand jury have been secret, as required by law, and whether a reporter for the Washington Post has not, in some unauthorized way, obtained access to grand-jury records.

Let us return now to the charge made against me to the effect that the speeches made by me on January 27 and 30 are being used by Nazi agents.

Naturally, I have no way of knowing by whom and how those two speeches are being used. To that charge suffice it to say that the Constitution itself may be used and quoted from by convicted criminals; that it is a common saying that the devil can quote Scripture for his own purpose.

For those two speeches I make not the slightest apology. Those speeches were printed in the RECORD at the time they were made. Later, permission to revise them was given on the floor, as is stated in the reprint of the two when they were combined.

In my judgment, anyone who can find anything in either of those speeches—copies of which will be furnished to any

Member desiring the same—which is disloyal, unpatriotic, un-American, must have a twisted and a warped mind or be in favor of surrendering our independence, hauling down our flag and becoming a principality or dominion of some world organization.

There is in those two speeches not one word which anyone who loves this country, who believes in our Constitution, who wants to preserve for our posterity the liberties and the freedom which we have enjoyed, can find any fault.

Those speeches have been referred to as "Roosevelt Is a Judas" speeches. That is a false statement. The reprint shows on its face that it is made in opposition to those who would destroy our national identity. The first one does use the words "a Judas," but it uses them in connection with the efforts of Clarence Streit and his associates, and I repeat that charge here and now that Streit and those who would destroy our national identity are betrayers of our country.

If Prosecutor Maloney and the grand jury are really interested in exposing sedition and subversive activities, I suggest to him that the grand jury, by investigation, obtain answers to the following:

First. Are our drafted men fighting in foreign lands for the preservation of our national identity?

Second. Do those fighting men need supplies and munitions of war, such as clothing, guns, ammunition, tanks, planes, ships?

Third. Is it not true that one member of a family is drafted for active 24-hour service?

Fourth. Is it not true that the brother or the father of the drafted man, when he seeks to aid in the production of the munitions or material the drafted man needs, is first required to pay a union before he can go to work?

Fifth. If a man can be drafted, as he is, to serve in a foreign land 24 hours a day in the fighting forces, why should his father or brother who remains at home be required to pay an initiation fee to a union when he seeks to work in support of the drafted man?

Sixth. What right has a union to require a man to pay an initiation fee and monthly dues as a condition precedent to national defense work?

Seventh. What, if anything, are you or the grand jury doing to end that unlawful, subversive conduct?

Eighth. Do you not know that exorbitant profits have been made by some corporations? If you do, what action are you or the grand jury taking to end that practice?

Apparently you are inquiring into my right to make a speech advocating the preservation of our National Government, the continuance of our Government under our Constitution.

Ninth. Why do you condemn such a speech and ignore activities which have actually interfered, and are today interfering, with the effort of our fighting men to preserve that Government?

If, in the opinion of Maloney, the speeches of January 27 and 30 are improper, why does he not investigate that portion of the press which car-

ries the statement that those speeches are "Roosevelt Is a Judas" speeches? Why does he not call before the grand jury Stokes of the Washington Post and ask him to point out the words in that speech which state that Roosevelt is a Judas? Why does he not ask Stokes whether he, too, believes that the Stars and Stripes should come down, that our Declaration of Independence should be disregarded, and that we should become a principality of some foreign nation? Why does he not ask Stokes whether he is an American or whether he is a subject of some foreign nation?

Let him ask Stokes whether he believes that we should continue to remain the United States of America or whether we should become a part of a world group.

Let me add that I have no apologies to make for the speeches of January 27 and January 30; that I defy anyone to find in them one word of disloyalty; one word that is un-American.

I have not now, I never had, any connection whatsoever with Vierick, with Hill, with Hudson, with Winrod, or anyone else who to my knowledge is circulating any pro-Nazi material. If any of those who have sent out copies of Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes are engaged in subversive or seditious activities, they are doing it without my knowledge and neither Prosecutor Maloney nor anyone else should criticize the fact that a patriotic talk such as Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes was given circulation.

The prosecutor has no more right to link me with any pro-Nazi agent than I would have to link him with a murderer or any other criminal who might be seen in the courtroom with him.

Let me reaffirm my opposition to all those who seek to destroy our Nation by subversive propaganda asking us to surrender our independence, to haul down the Stars and Stripes and hoist in lieu thereof a foreign flag, be it the flag of Hitler or the flag of a world supergovernment.

For me, the Stars and Stripes and the principles they represent are good enough.

I ask Prosecutor Maloney: Does he favor the hauling down of the Stars and Stripes? Does he think it adds to the war effort to tell our people that we should surrender our independence and now join in a United States of the World? Does he believe that we should appropriate, as asked by World Fellowship, Inc., \$1,100,000,000 to form a world government, while we now need every dollar of our resources to win this war?

I was told this morning that the district attorney—we will call him Mr. Maloney hereafter—wanted me down before the grand jury at 10:30. I just came back late last night, and having work on the desk, I thought that the district attorney could wait until this afternoon, so I told him I would be down at 3 o'clock, and, graciously, no objection was made.

After you go before a grand jury you cannot disclose anything that happens there; the proceedings of a grand jury, of course, are secret. What has been bothering me of late is the fact that for some time the papers have been telling

what the grand jury was doing and what the witnesses were supposed to have disclosed. For example, in this article this morning and in the press of the tenth, and of other dates, it is stated that according to grand-jury investigators I had been circulating or permitting somebody to circulate some of my material, someone who is an agent of the Nazi government. That statement is false. Now, where do the papers get that idea? How does the press know what the grand jury is doing? How do the boys of the press, how do the boys who report for the Washington Post know what things have happened, what proceedings have been had before the grand jury? I would suggest to Maloney that he investigate some of his own investigators, and that hereafter the information that is given out be given out in accordance with the law and with grand-jury procedure, with which he is doubtless familiar.

Going now to these charges that are made and to the newspaper headlines which state that I made a speech entitled "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes," that much of it is right. This is the rest of the title as given by some of the press, "Or Roosevelt Is a Judas": The title of that speech is "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes"—not "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes, or Roosevelt Is a Judas." I have copies of that reprint here, and I hope that every Member of the House will take one of them and see if they can find in that talk, which is a combination of two talks I made on the floor of the House, one on January 27 and the other on the 30th of January, any reference anywhere to the President as a Judas. The words "a Judas" were used, but how and where and to whom do they refer? Those two words have reference to Streit.

In the first part of the speech what was I talking about? I was talking about this group called World Fellowship, Inc., and another one, Federal Union, Inc. Here are the two of them.

What did those groups propose to do? We are in a war, a war which needs the efforts of every individual, yet that group seeks to distract the attention of our people by calling upon us at this time, a time of great national danger, to do what? To forsake and give up the Declaration of Independence adopted by our forefathers in 1776 and to adopt in place thereof a declaration of interdependence. They ask us, in effect, to haul down the Stars and Stripes and hoist in place thereof the flag of a world super-government.

The other organization, World Fellowship, Inc., came along, and they asked this House, through this circular, marked "Exhibit C," which every Member has received, to give the President of the United States on his birthday, January 30, and that is the date of the last speech, \$100,000,000—think of it—to be used for what? For the carrying on of the war? For the buying of munitions? For the buying of ships? No; no. They asked us to give \$100,000,000 to Tom, Dick, and Harry, men selected by the President as representatives of foreign nations, to form a United States of the World, of which we should be a part.

They go further and say that when the President has appointed these men—and who they will be no one knows—when he has appointed these men, and when they have written this constitution of the world government, which was to supersede or override at least, our Constitution, we were also to give to him by that same bill which they asked someone in the House to introduce, \$1,000,000,000 to be used at the discretion of these men to effectuate, to make active this United States of the World.

Is there any reason why every loyal American should not oppose with all his heart, with all his mind, and with all his strength an effort like that to betray our country?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield? I do not want to divert the gentleman from the course of his train of thought. But it seems to me the thing that the Members of the House would be immediately concerned with is how the gentleman's speeches happened to get into this publication, whether they were with or without his consent. That is the crux of the thing.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Get into what?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Into this circular, referred to in today's Post, that went out all over the country. This circular letter is said to have contained a copy of the gentleman's speech in which he refers to the President and other people, and I think it may fairly be assumed he meant to class them with Judas.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Who?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The President of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not do any such thing.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Read it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, I have read it. I wrote it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If the gentleman did not call him a Judas, that is about the only thing the gentleman has not called the President.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Whatever I said about him prior to our entry into the war I stand on, sir.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. What we would like to know is how the gentleman's speeches got into that letter.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When the gentleman suggests that there is a disloyal thought in my mind, he is just drawing on his imagination.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I did not suggest that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When the gentleman even thinks, on the other hand, that I am going to accept all of the President's policies, he is mistaken, and I have heard the gentleman himself stand on this floor and criticize the activities of this administration.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I may do it again.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is no question about that. You have condemned just as bitterly as I have the wasteful spending of this administration; you have condemned just as bitterly as I have the hiring of these fan dancers, these boondogglers, and teachers of horseshoe throwing, bowling, and all of those things.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. None of my speeches have ever been circulated by any subversive group. How did the gentleman's speech get into that letter?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is easily answered. You may just as well ask, How does anyone get a copy of the Bible when he goes to a hotel? There is a Gideon in many a hotel room, is there not? If you recited the Lord's Prayer on the floor of the Congress, is there any way by which you could prevent anyone, even a Nazi agent, from circulating it? I made those two speeches on the floor of the House. Certain women came into my office and asked if they could have copies of that reprint. I was going to send out those speeches to the people of my district, and I did send them out. These women wanted copies. I said, "All right." One of them was just as good, just as loyal a woman who ever lived; the other I did not know personally. Did the gentleman ever refuse anyone who came to him and wanted a copy of his speech?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I say right now we ought to be very scrupulously careful where our speeches go. I do not believe any Member of Congress ought to be permitted in this emergency to let anyone send his speeches anywhere. I think a Member of Congress ought to be permitted to send to his constituents whatever he wants to send under his own authority, but it is a dangerous thing in this emergency for us to permit speeches to be printed and promiscuously sent out in quantities to be circulated possibly for ulterior purposes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why, of course, for ulterior purposes. No Member of this House would send out speeches for ulterior purposes. Is it not true, as a matter of law and as a matter of fact, that I can order as many of the gentleman's speeches, and he can order as many of mine as he wants, if he pays for the printing?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is not true.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You can buy copies of the RECORD, can you not? And the RECORD will contain a copy of your speech.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman cannot have my speech reprinted without my consent at the Government Printing Office.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Wait a minute. Answer my question. Does the gentleman say I cannot send to the Public Printer and get a copy of the RECORD?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Oh, the gentleman can buy copies of the public RECORD.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman say that I cannot have as many reprinted as I wish?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman cannot, not by the Government Printing Office.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; but cannot I have them printed by anybody—an outside printer?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman's speech that was sent out was printed by the Government Printing Office and could only have been secured on his order, unless he gave someone else permission to have that reprinted.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is right about that, but answer the other question. When I get a copy of the gentleman's speech from the Public Printer, can I not at my own expense have as many reprinted as I want to?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Not in the form in which the gentleman's speech was circulated.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In any form.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Not at the Government Printing Office.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Some place else.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We are not talking about some place else.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman's speech came from the Government Printing Office. That is what he is talking about.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Sure it did.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. How did this association get quantities of the gentleman's speech?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will tell you in a moment. You answer my question. Can I not have the gentleman's speech reprinted at my own expense?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Not in that form.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In some other form, then. The gentleman knows I can.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I have been here 20 years, and I never knew a Congressman to have another Congressman's speech reprinted without his permission. I have not known it to happen. I do not think there is a Member of the body who would do it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is doubtless true. Speeches of Congressmen have been reprinted by other organizations at their own expense, not at the Government Printing Office, and the gentleman must be aware of it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman's speech, though, was from the Government Printing Office; it was not printed some place else.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not now. I want to tell him how these speeches got out.

I started to tell the gentleman how these speeches got out. I was ordering this reprint for circulation in my district, and it has been circulated in my district to every rural box holder. It is going to be circulated in my district to all of the city box holders in the district and, if I can get the names, to all of the individual voters in my district, because it has been charged as being a "Roosevelt Is a Judas" speech, and that is not true. Moreover, no greater service can be rendered at this time than to inform our people of this effort to destroy our Government. I am going to send one to every voter in my district, to every voter, and let him read it for himself. Let each voter see for himself how false is the charge that it is not 100-percent American. Some in the district have read it and they do not put any such construction on it as has the gentleman. What our people say is that this is no time to talk about doing away with our Constitution, this is no time to talk about the hauling down of our flag, this is no time to talk about the sur-

rendering of our national identity and becoming a part of a world supergovernment. Our people are all for the winning of the war but they will not support a movement to scrap our national existence. That is what they say at home.

When these speeches were ordered they came in. A woman who lives here in Washington—a gray-haired woman—came to the office, and she had a list of her friends in a book—printed. She asked me if she could have some of them to send to her friends. She sat down there at the desk and she directed those in franked envelopes to her friends, members of a patriotic organization. Is there anything wrong about that?

Not only that, but others that were sent out were sent out at the request of the people, all of whom I assume to be loyal Americans, who were contributing to or paid the cost of printing them. The district attorney here, if he wants, or anyone else who wants to know who paid for them, can come over to my office and get that information. The files are open. The letters are open that they wrote me asking for them. I would be glad to have the gentleman read some of the letters that were written requesting copies of those speeches. The gentleman might get a different idea as to what the speech was, and the purport of it, and the effect of it if he would read some of these letters, undoubtedly from patriotic Americans who think this is no time to talk of lowering the Stars and Stripes.

So those speeches went out in the flat as they were brought in here, not in franked envelopes. Speeches in franked envelopes went to the people of my district and the others went to these people outside the district and whatever they did with them, naturally, I do not know. I never met this man Viereck; and I never met this man Hill until he called at my office, stating that he was secretary for another Congressman, and made a request with reference to the RECORD; and I have no recollection of ever meeting Hudson or any of these other men named in the newspapers. Yet these papers charge that I, in some incomprehensible way, am hooked up with those men. That is a falsehood and every Member of this House ought to know it is a falsehood.

Going one step farther, what is this man Maloney doing anyway? It was reported to me this morning when I got here that Mr. Maloney had made the statement—and you Republicans ought to take notice of this—he wanted another year and he finally got 3 months, and at that time the statement was made that if he could get a 3 months' extension he would get every Republican, defeat every Republican, who is a Member of this House and who had been an isolationist prior to December 7. I am telling you over on that side, too, that you men who have been isolationists or you men who have been critical, are going to meet with the same fate.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a very serious accusation. Upon what basis

does the gentleman make that statement?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I make that statement on information conveyed to me this morning and upon the newspaper reports of his actions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; but will the gentleman state the source?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I will not state the source. If I did we would probably have that man before the grand jury.

Mr. McCORMACK. All right, the gentleman refuses, but the gentleman has made the statement that the Assistant United States Attorney—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Special attorney.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, he is connected with the Department of Justice and according to the gentleman he has said that, give him 3 months and he would defeat every Republican Member of the House. That is a very drastic statement and I think the gentleman ought to take the House into his confidence and inform the House the source of the statement and not leave it, as the gentleman has, a statement based upon hearsay evidence. In other words, somebody has told the gentleman from Michigan, apparently, according to what he says, that that statement was made, and the gentleman refuses to disclose who told him. If the gentleman did, that would be the best evidence. As the matter stands now that is purely hearsay. Would the gentleman want to leave himself in that position?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman wants to leave it that way. That is a drastic statement, but it is not as drastic as what the district attorney down here is doing. Just why does the district attorney down here want to mention the name of Hill in connection with my name? Why does he want to mention the name of Viereck in connection with my name? Those speeches are a matter of public record, and the sending out of them is a matter of public record if he wants to discover the truth. The number of copies printed and the price paid are matters of public record. What is he after? He is making ammunition for the campaign. That is what he is doing. If he wants to investigate subversive activities, why does he not investigate these people who want to go into this Union Now? I am not the only one who objects to that. Here is the dean of the House who had something to say on that subject. Look at the RECORD, page 887 January 30, when I was talking about this matter, I said:

That organization would inveigle our citizens into a united states of the world where their property, their incomes, would be at the mercy of Old World politicians.

I see before me the dean of the House, who has served here for more than 30 years. Because of his age and training, he has had a wealth of experience. He must know what the people, at least the people of his district and in the great city of Chicago, are thinking. I would inquire of him now for the purpose of information only, and no other purpose, whether he feels that if this movement to create a supergovernment, this movement to make us one of either the United States of the World, or United Nations—if this drive continues—whether our people will continue to have the same faith, the same enthusiasm for the policies of the administration they now have?

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] asked if I would yield, and I said yes, and he said:

Mr. SABATH. I will say to the gentleman that I am of the honest opinion that the American people will never give up their independence and the rights and the privileges that come to them because of our independence. They cherish it, they will fight for it, and will never agree that it be in any way abolished or modified.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. I hope that on the floor of this House, because he has great influence here and with the administration, he will use his influence and his voice to speak against this movement.

So I suggest to Maloney that he call before him the authors of those two page advertisements and the author of this circular, who wants us to appropriate \$1,100,000,000 for the purpose of forming a world supergovernment; and I suggest that he find out who supplies their funds, and who gives them the list that they send this material to, and what their purpose is.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very much interested in the gentleman's statement. I don't want to interrogate the gentleman from Michigan, but I am very much interested in the charge that he made, because if that is true, it is a very serious charge.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What charge?

Mr. McCORMACK. About the Special Assistant Attorney General's wanting an extension of time and his stating that if he had it he would defeat the Republicans. Of course, we know that is ridiculous, to begin with; that nobody could bring about that accomplishment; and I am concerned about that statement and, in fairness to a gentleman who cannot take the floor—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Whom does the gentleman mean—who cannot take the floor?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Maloney.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, he will have me down before the grand jury this afternoon, and you will see the whole thing spread through the newspapers in the morning, in the Washington Post.

Mr. McCORMACK. But the fact is the gentleman would not be down there except for these speeches that were printed by the Public Printer that had been used by the organization that was under investigation, so from that angle we have to look at the origin of them, and the gentleman is to blame himself; but coming back—

Mr. HOFFMAN. And what am I to blame for? Am I to be criticized because I insist upon the preservation of our national existence? I made a speech to that effect, it came into the hands of others who sent it out at their own expense with statements to which I do not subscribe. So I am told that even though the speech is patriotic, it should not have been made.

Mr. McCORMACK. Would the gentleman be willing to tell the House Judiciary Committee the source of that information?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I will keep it for Maloney if he wants it.

Mr. McCORMACK. What?

Mr. HOFFMAN. For Maloney. The gentleman knows him.

Mr. McCORMACK. I never met him.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He is the smear artist.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was he smearing when he convicted Vierick?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No, he was not; but even the devil himself has some good qualities.

Mr. McCORMACK. I investigated Mr. Vierick 6 years ago. He has always been a spy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did he not rewrite the President's speeches, or some of them?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know that the gentleman is any more correct in that than in the previous statement he made.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right. You say he did not. I do not know. That question just shows you and the Members how easy it is to ask a question and leave a distasteful thought. The gentleman does not claim that I ever knew Vierick or met him?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not even going into that. I accept the gentleman's word for it. I am only concerned about the statement that he made, the charge about the Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, he has the grand jury, and he has the power of subpoena and the power of administering an oath, and he can get all of that information himself.

Mr. McCORMACK. I always believe in respecting character and reputation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then the gentleman better talk to Maloney.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am talking to the gentleman from Michigan. I do not know Mr. Maloney.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Neither do I—never met him.

Mr. McCORMACK. I give the gentleman one more opportunity—

Mr. HOFFMAN. You do not need to; I answer "No" now.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman want to disclose the source of his information?

Mr. HOFFMAN. You do not need to ask the question. I answer "No."

Mr. McCORMACK. Did this woman pay for the speeches?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Part of them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman state how much he purchased and how much she did?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I cannot tell without the record. If the gentleman wants to call my office, I will tell him. They paid part and I paid part.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman think that Congress should pass a law that would forbid the reprinting of speeches unless the Member who made the speeches paid for them, would be a good thing?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I think that kind of a law in connection with a law which would prevent the bureaucrats sending out their propaganda might be a good thing, because we do not send out one fraction of what they do. Of late, for

several years, Government funds have been used to popularize the pet theories of bureaucrats.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. FISH. I desire at this time to put into the Record a statement of a newspaper reporter giving a brief account of a dinner held recently at the Willard Hotel at which the speakers called for the liquidation of all leading noninterventionists by every possible means, including the Mann Act, income tax, or direct attack or smearing. The war is being fought to save America from Nazi methods and the fear of the gestapo, yet it is proposed by the overseas writers to outdo the worst features of Hitler's Germany to destroy freedom of speech and purge Members of Congress for trying to keep America out of war unless attacked, prior to Pearl Harbor. That is the surest way to discord and disunity and a disservice toward winning the war. At a luncheon the other day Senator HIRAM JOHNSON came over to me and he was so mad he could hardly speak. He asked me if I had seen or heard about a certain dinner of the overseas reporters a week or so ago. I said I had not. Then he proceeded to tell me about it and asked me to look at what John O'Donnell wrote in the newspaper about it. This is what I found. It comes from the Washington Times-Herald of Monday, March 30, 1942. It is headed "Extract from 'Capitol Stuff,' by John O'Donnell, page 13, March 30, 1942," and it reads as follows:

Saturday night members of the Cabinet and Supreme Court were guests at the Willard of the Overseas Writers Association, and heard some bloodthirsty appeals, with much talk of concentration camps and treason, from ex-reporters now turned starry-eyed crusaders at so much per month or per lecture.

The American press which had opposed this Nation's intervention in the war before the Pearl Harbor attack were hammered lustily, with the anvil chorus led by the three former reporters of the Chicago Tribune.

The significant point is that such potent Roosevelt advisers as Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter—

I am told that Secretary of the Navy Knox was there also—

and the paid personnel of the official propaganda agencies applauded lustily such declarations as: "The American Senate must be taught the facts of life. * * * The important thing is to put an end to criticism of the Roosevelt administration by whatever means may be necessary. * * * Be ruthless as the enemy. * * * Get him on his income tax or the Mann Act. * * * Hang him * * * shoot him * * * or lock him up in a concentration camp."

Those in sooth are wild and whirling words. But the fact that they were proclaimed at a Washington dinner party before men who are directing the Nation's war effort and that they received an emotional administration claque, indicates the drift of the time. After all, there's a national election on the way. And a tighter censorship.

I spoke to Senator TAFT, who was nearby, and asked him what he knew about it. He said he knew about it and had a copy of it and thought it was disgraceful. I understand also that Senator VANDENBERG was there, and said that this

account understates and does not do justice to what was said. When speeches like that are made and go out in the public press that they intend to get all the noninterventionists, particularly the leaders, and to purge them one way or another, stop at nothing, the time has come for the noninterventionists to fight back, and if we are going to be purged through the income tax, through attacks of that kind and smear attacks, it is time for the Congress to take some cognizance of it and to defend the right of free speech and of Members of Congress to send out and distribute their speeches.

I want these remarks to go right into the Record at this point.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield to me to ask the gentleman from New York a question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Very briefly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Not to enter into a discussion, because remarks of that kind, if made, we would all condemn. But as I understand the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], he is trying to connect up the administration because a few happened to be there, if they were there, when those remarks were made. They were made by one or two or three former associates, reporters, or whatever they were, of the Chicago Tribune. Is that right?

Mr. FISH. I was not there. It says they were formerly reporters on the Tribune, but Justice Frankfurter was there.

Mr. McCORMACK. Have you ever been present at a gathering when somebody made a statement that you did not agree with?

Mr. FISH. But I understand they were applauding the statements, which appeared in the press.

Mr. McCORMACK. Senator VANDENBERG was there?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. You would not say that his presence there gave any sinister aspect to it?

Mr. FISH. I think Senator VANDENBERG will speak for himself at the proper time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, yes.

Mr. FISH. He undoubtedly holds the same view I hold, and probably most other Members of Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. But Senator VANDENBERG was there the same as the others who were there?

Mr. FISH. But Senator VANDENBERG was not applauding those remarks.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is in a very embarrassing position to sell his point, particularly in view of the position taken by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] at this particular occasion.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot yield any further, Mr. Speaker. Replying to what the gentleman from New York said, those remarks just quoted by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] were made down here, as I understand it, at some dinner. Of course, everyone who was there did not subscribe to them, nor is everyone who was there to be criticized because they were made. I am asking now how anyone can criticize me,

how the district attorney can find fault with me because I made a speech in which there was not one word of seditious or subversive material, and that was sent out by someone else with his own views. How can you criticize any one Member of the House on account of that procedure? There is not a thing wrong with the speech. If there was something wrong with that speech, why did not somebody on the majority side object when it was made? Why has not somebody asked that it be stricken from the Record? It is a matter of public record. There it is. It has been in the Record since January 30 and not 1 of the 434 Members of this House has questioned it or asserted that it is not a patriotic speech. Because someone alleged to be connected with Hitler picked it up and sent it out I am called on the carpet.

Calling attention to and exposing this movement to destroy our national existence; asking for unity under our own Government, allegiance to our own Government alone, serves notice upon Hitler that united our people will fight him to the bitter end. It might well be said that those who would suppress talks of this kind, who would condemn a Member of Congress because he objects to our domestic affairs being governed and controlled by a group of internationalists, lend encouragement to Hitler.

What about the loyalty of the paper PM, and of its reporter who falsely, as can be noted by every man who reads the speech "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes," asserts that that speech was entitled "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes, or Roosevelt Is a Judas"?

What about the loyalty of the newspaper and its staff writer, Dillard Stokes, when in the Washington Post that writer stated that in the speech "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes," President Roosevelt was called a Judas? Stokes knows that he lied when he wrote that, and it is apparent that he did it deliberately. He is so filled with venom that he must hate himself. Certainly the truth is not in him.

I see the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] sitting before me. Not long ago his name was coupled in a similar way in connection with proposed labor legislation. One of the papers out in our country, a Detroit paper, reported that Frankenstein told the convention of the C. I. O. that they might just as well accept the 48-hour week, because if they did not VINSON—he is the chairman of your Naval Affairs Committee—DIES, and Cox, and HOFFMAN would be happy men and Congress would ram it down their throats. I do not know why they are accepting it—probably because they find public sentiment swinging that way now. But to get back to this talk, get this paragraph:

While we are celebrating today the President's birthday we should have this other movement in mind. There are many of us who in the past have bitterly opposed some of the President's political policies. There are some of us who will continue to oppose those domestic policies while giving him support in the effort to win the war. There is none, however, who should in my judgment at least not be able and willing to join in the hope that God will grant him many happier returns of the day. We can all join

in the request that God give him wisdom, and strength, and courage to frown upon such efforts as the one which is here suggested.

Now, what is the district attorney after? What are these others, who made such speeches as the gentleman from New York referred to, after? What are they trying to accomplish? You know what they are trying to accomplish: They are trying to silence every single man who criticizes anything that this administration advocates. They are trying to suppress free speech, the freedom of the press. This drive seems to be a follow-up to the recent Biddle bill. The suppression of free speech is what they are trying to bring about. That is their purpose. And if we let them succeed then that is the end of representative government in this country.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I wish the gentleman, when he goes before the grand jury, would ask Mr. Maloney what has become of the investigation and the report that is due Congress on subversive employees on the Federal pay roll that has grown from 500 when the Dies committee first called it to the attention of the House, to 1,100 when the Attorney General asked the Dies committee for a report just this last year, and now the list has grown to over 3,000; and the Attorney General has not seen fit to give the report to Congress even though there is a positive mandate that they should give it? I would like to find out why the grand jury's attention has not been called to these subversive people on the Federal pay roll.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When I go before the grand jury they will be asking and I shall be answering. It will not be my privilege to ask anything or to suggest anything, and that is why I am making this statement today so that this afternoon after I have been before the grand jury and some fellows say, "Well, that is an executive session, but I wish you would tell us how they are getting along; what they ask you, what you said." I cannot tell them anything. I will suggest this further thing to the United States District Attorney, suggest it now, not when I go before the grand jury, but I am going to ask him a question here. I want him to answer this question. Our men are going to war, they need munitions of war. On this side of the highway goes a long unending line of American boys and men, the best in our country, physically. They are going, all of them, willingly and gladly, but they have to go whether they want to or whether they do not want to. They are going to be inducted to fight, to sacrifice their lives if need be, to serve 24 hours a day, 7 days in the week. Over on this other side of this same highway is an unending line of men knocking at the factory gate, but they do not get in until they come across with a stated sum of money paid to an agency which is not a Government agency. On one side of the street you march them down; you make them serve, you make them fight, and on the other side of the street the brothers, and the fathers who are seeking to manufacture clothing and implements of war,

the guns, the tanks, and the ships, see this Government stand by and say to them, "No, you cannot go in and work in support of the man who has gone to war until you pay the organization of Green, or Murray, \$2, \$5, \$50, \$100, or \$200, and monthly dues."

Let some district attorney investigate that. There is something that is subversive. There is something that is not only seditious but is action which stops production. Do they want something real? Do they want to investigate and prosecute something that actually hinders the war effort? They need not fool around with the circulation of any speech I have made, if that is what they are after.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. If the gentleman cannot ask questions, in one of his answers he might make the suggestion that they worked around for 3½ or 4 years with Harry Bridges, who has destroyed hundreds of millions of dollars of property, who has destroyed the merchant marine, yet we have not had an Attorney General who has had the intestinal fortitude to take him. You have had a Secretary of Labor who has protected him, and all down through the Government they have protected him. Make some suggestion, if these men are anxious to have real government, why they do not go into their own Government and take men like Harry Bridges and Fritz Kuhn. If these birds want to know something, why do they not go into something real? Make some suggestions along that line.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The record shows over the last few years that some of these officials are not interested in the activities of the Communists; they are not interested in the racketeers; they are not interested in the men who by force and violence prevent other men from working in the defense of their country; they are not interested in the men who charge a fee for the exercise of patriotic efforts by others. Oh, no; they are not interested in that. They are interested in Republicans; they are interested in Democrats who have criticized some of the crackpot schemes and object to some of these crackpots, as the Democrats have designed them, being employed in Government offices.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I have tried earnestly and consistently since we got into this war to support every move of this administration which had any tendency to aid in winning the war. I have criticized, and I intend to criticize, those who want to betray our country and force us into an international world super-government, thereby doing away with our constitutional form of government and the hauling down of our flag. If the Attorney General or the district attorney, Maloney, can make anything out of that, or if anybody else can make anything out of that, they are welcome.

My people at home know what I have been saying. If they do not like it, if they do not approve of it, next November

they will have the opportunity to express their will, and they will, you need not worry about that. If I do not come back, then you know the ideas I have advanced are not the ones to which they subscribe, or perhaps you will know that Maloney, Winchell, and a few more of that kind have succeeded in their campaign, and that I have been prevented from presenting my side of the argument adequately. However, I am satisfied. They told me at home when I was there, and I got a response when I spoke, bless your dear hearts, before an audience of U. A. W., C. I. O.'s, who wore the caps—they said they were not going to ask for time and a half or double pay. That is the U. A. W., C. I. O., that we have in the Fourth Congressional District. They are not going to ask for it. They said they were not. That is the rank and file. Whatever a few leaders may demand, the workers themselves do not intend to ask anything unfair.

I am satisfied from that expression of opinion, as well as from the others that I got at home, that our people are more realistic about this war, are more ready to make complete sacrifice than are the officials here in Washington, and I intend to continue to do all I can along that same line.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. May I say to the gentleman that we admire the stand he has taken.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Never mind that. If the gentleman has something to ask let us have it.

Mr. RICH. I wonder why the gentleman has to subject himself to a grand jury investigation. I admire the great courage he has in going down there.

Why does he have to submit to a grand jury that is trying to wreck him? It is not necessary.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have no reason to believe the grand jury is trying to wreck me, and no citizen of this country, least of all myself, should object, and I certainly do not, to going before a grand jury any time and answering questions. It is only a man who is guilty of some offense, a man who has violated some law, who objects to answering to the grand jury or to any prosecuting officer. I am going.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Along the line the gentleman has been speaking, may I say that the people out in the country know what is going on. They are doing what they can to win the war. They know what is going on in Washington. Has the gentleman read the first article in the last Reader's Digest along the very line the gentleman is talking about, as to the great amount of time being spent in Washington in cocktail lounges instead of trying to win the war in Washington?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman complained a little bit about the construction I put on his speech, and this is the copy of the reprint he handed

me. As the gentleman well knows, in the front of his first speech he, himself, put the subheading, "A Judas."

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Who was the gentleman talking about?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Streit. Let me read the whole paragraph:

That war, the cost of which no man can estimate and which, if carried on according to present plans, will take the lives of millions of American men, the President and his supporters tell us is being fought to bring to other peoples the same right of independence and self-government which we have enjoyed.

Then the next paragraph:

The hypocrisy of those who claim that to be the purpose of our present involvement in this war is clearly demonstrated when we receive from them a petition to repudiate our own independence, surrender our existence as an independent Nation, and become a part of the United States of the World.

Note the words "from them."

That petition came from Streit and others, not from the President.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. So the gentleman was talking about Streit?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly, and Ickes up there. He signed the thing.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They were the two Judases the gentleman was referring to. The gentleman did not mean to call the President of the United States a Judas or hypocrite?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no. I never lack words when I want to criticize. If I intended to call the President a Judas I undoubtedly would have said so on the floor of this House. I had no such intention and I did not so state.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am glad to have the gentleman's affirmation that he did not mean to call the President a hypocrite or a Judas.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why, certainly not. That speech is entitled "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes." One distinguished gentleman up there in the Press Gallery, Crawford, of PM, said the speech was entitled "Don't Haul Down the Flag or the President Is a Judas." There is no such implication in it. That is not the title of the speech—Crawford knew the title was "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes." Yet he deliberately stated that untruth. Why? There is not a Member on this floor who does not know that I have never hesitated to express my opinion here. If I had wanted to charge somebody with something, I would not do it indirectly.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman has been very gracious about permitting interruptions and I certainly have no ulterior motive in what I will say to the gentleman, if the gentleman will indulge me. The difficulty, I think, is not what the gentleman has said in his speech. I think the gentleman or any other Member of Congress ought to have the right to differ as emphatically as he wishes to differ with the policy of any administration. That is not the difficulty. I would be the last one to do more than just to take friendly issue with the gentleman upon what he might say.

The difficulty here has been that the gentleman's speech has been taken and diverted and distorted, according to his statement, from what it really meant,

and put into the channels of subversive elements, then found itself in an envelope from a subversive group advising the people to secure arms and to prepare and be ready for a revolution.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not know anything about that. I never heard or read of anything of that kind until the gentleman just stated it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think the Members of this Congress ought to protect themselves from that. A Member of Congress ought to have the right to say whatever he wants to say and to mail it to his own constituents and to be prepared to take the responsibility. He should not be permitted to print things and put them in the hands of or even permit them to get into the hands of elements that are going to divert and distort them and put them entirely out of their own meaning, and put such an interpretation on them as was put on this affair. It puts the whole House of Representatives under indictment, and it ought to be stopped by this body as a whole by some policy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In reply to what the gentleman from Virginia has said, I agree with all he has said, except one thing. The gentleman said we should prevent speeches getting into certain hands and from being distorted. I will be glad to learn how we can prevent distortion when we cannot anticipate it. How could I know that Crawford would write or his paper publish a false title to that patriotic talk? I would not knowingly send out any remarks of mine to any agent of a foreign power, or to anyone who I thought would give it to any foreign agent, or use it for an improper purpose. But here comes the difficulty. For example, the D. A. R. writes me for speeches. I feel flattered because the D. A. R. writes me asking for speeches, and so would every other Member, and they would admit it if modesty did not forbid. The D. A. R. is all right. No one questions its loyalty. Suppose one of the members of the D. A. R. asks me for 50 or 500 copies of a speech. I think the speech is all right. They do, too. I send it to them and they give it to someone else, thinking that that third party is all right. The speech ultimately finds its way into improper hands. These agents do not come out and advertise their activities. They work under cover. So it is that these things happen. How can that be prevented?

If this House wishes to adopt the policy for the duration of the war of denying to Senators and to its Members the right to express loyal, patriotic views in the halls of Congress, or, if it permits the making of such speeches, to deny to Senators and to Members of the House the right to send those speeches out to their constituents or, as has been here suggested, to other citizens of the United States whose loyalty is unquestioned, just because some of those speeches may fall into the hands of others who send them out with their own subversive publications, so be it.

If we adopt that policy, then, in fairness to our people, we should prevent the publication by administration spokesmen, by the press generally, of all infor-

mation which in any way tends to criticize, unjustly or justly, anything that any Government official may do. Such a bill was recently before the Senate. It received but scant consideration.

The issue here today is whether or not free speech, speech which is not subversive, which is not seditious, which carries an argument for the preservation of our national existence, shall be suppressed simply because someone who is not considered patriotic, who may be found to be an agent of a foreign power, circulates that loyal, patriotic utterance.

As I stated not long ago, the devil himself can quote Scripture to serve his purpose, and it occurs to me that those who find fault with this particular speech entitled "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes," seem to be inclined to do that very thing. It occurs to me that they, rather than myself, are giving encouragement to Hitler; are telling him that we, as a people, are about ready—as we would be if their views prevailed—to give up our national existence.

Following are the three advertisements advocating a world super-government:

EXHIBIT A

[From the New York Times of December 18, 1941]

TO WIN THIS WAR WE NEED UNION NOW A PETITION ON THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS

That the President of the United States submit to Congress a program for forming a powerful union of free peoples to win the war, the peace, the future;

That this program unite our people, on the broad lines of our Constitution, with the people of Canada, the United Kingdom, Eire, Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa, together with such other free peoples, both in the Old World and the New, as may be found ready and able to unite on this federal basis;

That this program be only the first step in the gradual, peaceful extension of our principles of federal union to all peoples willing and able to adhere to them, so that from this nucleus may grow eventually a universal world government of, by, and for the people.

To the 30,000,000 Who Favor Union:

Thirty million American adults, according to the December Fortune survey, already believe the United States "after the war" should "join a union of democracies in all parts of the world to keep order."

If you are among those who agree we need union then to keep a potential aggressor from breaking loose, surely you must agree we need that union now to meet the powerful combination of aggressors already on the march.

We are now in one of those molten moments when the iron of basic policy can and will be somehow shaped. If we fail to form it in a union now we may all too soon find ourselves repeating the Franco-British tragedy. We may find that, while we put our time on lesser things, events were hammering the iron into another form, into an alliance with men and methods molded in a structure which only its collapse could change.

In union there is power

We must not let up for one instant in our prosecution of the war. We must unrelentingly prosecute it. Organizing the power of the democracies is essential to that task. Organizing it effectively in a union will distract us no more from defense than improving the cumbersome, entangling structure of an alliance.

There already exist carefully studied concrete plans for just the kind of emergency union that we need. These plans provide not only for representation responsible to the people and in proportion to self-governing population. They work out the details and assure the American people a majority in the union congress at the start.

Granted, the immediate extension of our Federal principles is practicable only with those of our associates in the war willing and able to combine on this basis. But it would be utter folly to delay applying them where possible simply because they cannot now be universally extended. Common sense says to unite at once with those practiced in democracy and to cooperate with the others the best way we can, until they too shall desire, and can apply, these Federal democratic principles.

Remember now what happened to the League Covenant after the war. Remember now the moral slump that always follows war, the return of petty politics. Consider now that if we merely promise union after the war, the Axis will drive their peoples on by reminding them of what a Senate minority did to the promised League after World War No. 1. But once the oppressed peoples see that this union is no dream but a living, growing, winning world United States, with a place in its Congress they may earn by regaining their own freedom—what a means we then shall have to wreck the Axis from within.

In union there is peace

How many, many lives we shall save by this great expeditionary idea when once we give it life. It will be fighting for our sons day and night, awake or sleeping, for it will be fighting, too, for the sons of German, Italian, Japanese mothers, who know not what they do. It will be fighting for us far behind the enemy lines, where our warplanes rarely reach. No dictator can clamp his hand upon it, or be certain it will not one day be fighting for us in its staff itself.

The surest way to shorten and to win this war is also the surest way to guarantee to ourselves and our friends and foes that this war will end in a world united states. The surest way to do all this is for us to start that union now.

"We implore you (as the English workmen implored Lincoln to free the slaves) not to faint in your providential mission. While your enthusiasm is aflame and the tide of events runs high, let the work be finished effectively. Leave no root of bitterness to spring up and work fresh misery to your children."

As citizens to our fellow citizens, we recommend this proposal to your serious consideration.

Grenville Clark, Gardner Cowles, Jr.,
Russell W. Davenport, John Foster
Dulles, Harold L. Ickes, Owen J.
Roberts, Harry G. Scherman, Wm.
Jay Schieffelin.

THE UNITED STATES ITSELF BEGAN AS A WAR MEASURE

We the people of the United States have once more reached a time to try men's souls. Let us not mistake this moment nor the nature of this test. Lincoln measured it for us when he said, "We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth."

Here stands the free principle that the state—the world—is made for all men equally. We hold its citadel.

There rises the despotic dogma that one man is the state. In Berlin is centered the direction of its far-flung land, sea, air, and undercover forces, highly centered behind a ruthless master plan.

Disunion was the European way

How much longer can we let our answer be the same old fatal answer—divided navies, divided armies, divided production, divided

councils, divided actions, divided democracies * * * falling underneath a common yoke? Shall we risk answering with an alliance? Stake our all upon this method that has already brought catastrophe to France and Britain?

We recognize already that we must unite the power of all our 48 States. We recognize that the British must unite the power of all their Commonwealth of Nations. We have not recognized—and we must at once—that we need above all to unite the whole arch together. We must unite both sides upon a keystone. Then the common burden will but unite us more.

An arch without a keystone can be no arch of triumph.

What shall the keystone be? Let us seek guidance from those master builders who raised our own citadel of freedom.

They, the people of our Original Thirteen States, once faced the problem we face now. They had never before united in any way for any purpose. But when their common freedom was at stake they did not try to save it with 13 independent armies or even with a supreme interallied council. Instead, with revolutionary vision and vigor, they invented a new and stronger keystone.

They set up at once a common government. They gave that Government the power to make war and peace for all.

They gave it the power to name one common commander in chief.

And they issued through it a resounding declaration of the universal and eternal common principles of human freedom on which they proposed to build a new world.

Thus, in the midst of war, they created the United States itself as a war measure.

They then developed this emergency war policy into a permanent way to keep the peace among their States by adopting a more perfect Union in our Federal Constitution.

Union is the American way

Since then every American generation has boldly extended these principles of freedom through union to more states and more people of all kinds.

Canada, Australia, the Union of South Africa have already adopted these same principles. Britain showed its faith in them when it begged France, tragically too late, to change alliance into union.

Here, then, in our own American principles of Federal Union lies the time-tested answer to our problem. Here lies the way to win this war, the peace, and the future. We are not so feeble that we cannot achieve greatly, as our fathers achieved before us. Let us then take up this task at once and turn this great danger into a great opportunity. Let us begin now a World United States.

Federal Union, Inc., A. J. G. Priest, chairman; Clarence K. Streit, president; E. W. Balduf, director; P. F. Brundage, secretary; John Howard Ford, treasurer; Patrick Welch, acting director.

EXHIBIT B

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 5, 1942]

IN UNION NOW LIES POWER TO WIN THE WAR AND THE PEACE A PETITION

That the President of the United States submit to Congress a program for forming a powerful union of free peoples to win the war, the peace, the future.

That this program unite our people, on the broad lines of our Constitution, with the people of Canada, the United Kingdom, Eire, Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa, together with such other free peoples, both in the Old World and the New, as may be found ready and able to unite on this federal basis.

That this program be only the first step in the gradual, peaceful extension of our prin-

ciples of federal union to all peoples willing and able to adhere to them, so that from this nucleus may grow eventually a universal world government of, by, and for the people.

THE UNITED STATES ITSELF BEGAN AS A WAR MEASURE

We welcome President Roosevelt's conferences with Prime Minister Churchill, and the "Declaration of United Nations." We must prosecute the war unrelentingly. Organizing effectively the power of the free peoples is essential to that task. We value highly conferences and temporary measures to provide more unified action immediately. But in meeting this need let us, in the present formative period, take care to open—not close—the way to immediate union of the democracies within the broader anti-Axis coalition.

Conferences, agreements between heads of governments, alliances, supreme interallied councils—valuable as they may be—these are not union, but substitutes that have already failed democracy. The British and French relied on them. They had a unified command. They agreed to make no separate peace. But they based their unity on two sovereign governments, acting in alliance, not on a united sovereign people acting in union through a common government. And their alliance collapsed.

Alliance failed the British and French

Prime Minister Churchill sought salvation then in the American way of union. He implored France to join Britain in this declaration of union:

"* * * France and Great Britain shall no longer be two nations but one Franco-British Union. The constitution of the union will provide for joint organs of defense, foreign, financial, and economic policies. Every citizen of France will enjoy immediate citizenship of Great Britain; every British subject will become a citizen of France * * * During the war there shall be a single war cabinet, and all the forces of Britain and France, whether on land, sea, or in the air, will be placed under its directions * * *"

Now the responsibility is ours, either to create or defer too long that common community or state, whose importance Mr. Churchill stressed in the Senate December 26. Shall we begin with the British back where they began with the French? Or where they left off—with an offer of union now, the old, war-tested United States way?

Organizing the democracies effectively in a union need take no longer than organizing them in an ineffective alliance or supreme war council, and will safeguard their national rights far more securely and equally. There already exist carefully studied concrete plans for just the kind of emergency union that we need. These plans provide for representation responsible to the people and in proportion to self-governing population. They work out the details and assure the American people a majority in the union congress at the start.

The Soviet States have a common government

Granted, immediate extension of our democratic Federal principles to all our war associates is impracticable. But common sense says to unite at once with those practiced in democracy while cooperating with the others in the best way we can, until they desire and can apply our principles.

We gain from the fact that all the Soviet Republics are already united in one government, as are also all the Chinese-speaking people, once so divided. Surely we and they must agree that union now of the democracies wherever possible is equally to the general advantage. Victory depends in no small part on sea and air factors, now divided between Britain and us, whose nature requires a common government even more than do the land factors in Russia and China, vast and important as they are.

We the people of the United States have once more reached a time to try men's souls. Let us not mistake this moment nor the nature of this test. Lincoln measured it for us when he said, "We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth."

We recognize already that we must unite the power of all our 48 States. We recognize that the British must unite the power of all their Commonwealth of Nations. We have not recognized—and we must at once—that we need above all to unite the whole arch of democracy.

An arch without a keystone can be no arch of triumph.

Union Is the United States Way

The people of our original Thirteen States once faced the problem the democracies face now. They had never before united for any purpose. But when their common freedom was at stake they did not try to save it with 13 independent armies, or even with a "supreme interallied council." Instead, with revolutionary vision and vigor, they invented a new and stronger keystone:

They set up at once a common Government. They gave it the power to make war and peace for all.

They let it name one common Commander in Chief.

And they issued through it a resounding declaration of the universal and eternal common principles of human freedom on which they proposed to build a New World.

Thus, in the midst of war, they created the United States itself as a war measure.

They then developed this emergency war policy into a permanent way to keep the peace among their States by adopting a more perfect Union in our Federal Constitution. Since then, every American generation has boldly extended these principles of freedom through union to more states and more people of all kinds. Canada, Australia, the Union of South Africa have already adopted these principles. Britain showed its faith in them when it offered union to France.

Here, then, in our own American principles of Federal Union lies the way to win this war, the peace, and the future. We are not so feeble that we cannot do what our fathers have already done. Let us then turn this great danger into a great opportunity. Let us begin now a World United States.

As citizens to our fellow citizens: We recommend this proposal to your serious consideration.

Robert Woods Bliss, Grenville Clark, Gardiner Cowles, Jr., Russell W. Davenport, John Foster Dulles, Harold L. Ickes, Owen J. Roberts, Daniel Calhoun Roper, Wm. Jay Schieffelin.

THIRTY MILLION AMERICANS FAVOR UNION

Thirty million American adults, according to the December Fortune survey, already believe the United States after the war should join a union of democracies in all parts of the world to keep order.

If you are among those who agree we need union then to keep a potential aggressor from breaking loose, surely you must agree we need that union now to meet the powerful combination of aggressors already on the march.

To refuse to recognize this so as to avoid controversy will not save our sons, any more than failure to recognize that a germ caused diphtheria saved life in the past.

Remember now the moral slump that always follows war, the return of petty politics. Consider now that if we merely promise union after the war, the Axis will drive their peoples on by reminding them of what a Senate minority did to the promised League * * * after World War No. 1. But once the oppressed peoples see that this union is no dream but a living, growing, winning world United States, with a place in its Congress they may earn by regaining their own

freedom—what a means we then shall have to wreck the Axis from within.

How many, many lives we shall save by this great expeditionary idea—once we give it life. It will be fighting for our sons day and night far behind the enemy lines. No dictator can be certain it will not be fighting for us in his staff itself.

The surest way to shorten and to win this war is also the surest way to guarantee to ourselves, and our friends and foes, that this war will end in a union of the free. The surest way to do all this is for us to start that union now.

"We implore you [as the English workmen implored Lincoln to free the slaves] not to faint in your providential mission. While your enthusiasm is aflame, and the tide of events runs high, let the work be finished effectually. Leave no root of bitterness to spring up and work fresh misery to your children."

Federal Union, Inc.; A. J. G. Priest, chairman; Clarence K. Streit, president; E. W. Baldur, director; P. F. Brundage, secretary; John Howard Ford, treasurer; Patrick Welch, acting director.

EXHIBIT C

In Time of War—Prepare for Peace—World Fellowship, Inc.

(Started in 1918—the Armistice year)

A continuous world government convention centers in its new year-round world fellowship center (388 acres, six buildings)—inviting people of all countries, races, classes, creeds, and conditions to develop "ideals for world government, of, for, and by the people."

On New Hampshire 16, 5 miles south of Conway. Address for mail, telegrams, bus, railway, freight, express: Conway, N. H. Telephone Madison 4-22.

CHARLES F. WELLER,

Founder and President.

EUGENIA WINSTON WELLER,

Secretary.

(The two general executives.)

LOUIS A. BOWMAN, Treasurer.

(LaSalle National Bank, Chicago, and Carroll County Trust Co., Conway, N. H.)

L. I. PUTNAM, C. P. A.,

Auditor.

To Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America:

We ask the Members of the Senate and House to take the three steps presented here for your consideration. We shall be glad to appear before any committee of the House or Senate or before a joint session to answer any and all questions.

We hope these two joint resolutions will be introduced and passed by Congress on the President's birthday, January 30, 1942. A present to him, to us, to the world.

CHARLES DAVIS, C. E., D. ENG.,

Founder-Trustee, World Government Foundation and Honorary President World Peace Association, Jenkins, Minn.

CARL A. RYAN,

Secretary-Treasurer.

(With over 300 cooperating organizations in 56 countries.)

Approved by:

CHARLES F. WELLER,

Founder and President, World Fellowship, Inc.

GEORGE C. DIEHL,

Chairman, Executive Committee, World Government Foundation.

DARWIN J. MESSEROLE,

Director of Legislation, World Government Foundation.

STEP 1

To be enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to set up and create a Federation of the World, a World Peace Government, under the title of the United Nations of the World.

Whereas we hold these truths to be self-evident:

1. Peoples, savage or civilized, have never lived together save under some form of government.

2. All governments exist by their successful organization and use of the spiritual, intellectual, and physical forces of mankind.

3. A government losing control of these forces falls.

4. Village, town, city, county, provincial, and state governments do not ask the abandonment of the other governments or the national government for them to exist, for each is supported by and dependent for its very existence on the others, as they will be under a world government.

5. Lack of government means chaos in its territory—hence world chaos and its wars throughout the ages.

6. The world without a government has always been and always will be at war until there is a world government in control of the spiritual, intellectual, and physical forces needed for its existence.

7. As with villages, towns, cities, counties, provinces, states, and nations a world government can bring " * * * on earth peace, good will toward men," a goal worthy of the efforts of all mankind.

8. Peace—not war—makes for the safety of mankind.

9. Peace—not war—makes for the preservation of mankind.

10. Peace—not war—makes for the well-being of mankind.

11. Peace—not war—makes for the prosperity of mankind.

12. Peace—not war—makes for the world trade of mankind.

13. Peace—not war—makes for the profits of mankind; and

Whereas belief in these thirteen self-evident truths makes it necessary at the present juncture of human affairs to enlarge the bases of organized society by establishing a government for the community of nations, in order to preserve civilization and enable mankind to live in peace and be free: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress of the United States of America does hereby solemnly declare that all peoples of the earth should now be united in a commonwealth of nations to be known as the United Nations of the World, and to that end it hereby gives to the President of the United States of America all the needed authority and powers of every kind and description without limitations of any kind that are necessary in his sole and absolute discretion to set up and create the federation of the world, a world peace government under the title of the United Nations of the World including its constitution and personnel and all other matters needed or appertaining thereto to the end that all nations of the world may by voluntary action become a part thereof under the same terms and conditions.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of \$100,000,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary to be expended by the President in his sole and absolute discretion to effectuate the purposes of this joint resolution and in addition the sum of \$1,000,000,000 for the immedi-

ate use of the United Nations of the World under its constitution as set up and created by the President of the United States of America as provided in this joint resolution.

The President may appoint such committees and summon such advisers, from any part of the world, as he may deem necessary to effectuate the foregoing purposes with all convenient speed.

STEP 2

(Should be taken the same day as step 1)

To be enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to create a world government

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions or legislatures in three-fourths of the several States:

"Article 22. Creation of a world government

"SECTION 1. The United States shall have power to create, ordain, form, set up, establish, join, enter, unite with, and become a part of a world government.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to put into effect and to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

STEP 3

When step two has been ratified by the people of the United States of America, acting through the legislatures of our 48 States or Congress will have the power, under section 2 of article 22 of the Constitution of the United States of America, to enact the needed legislation to provide for the entrance of the United States of America into the world government set up by our great President and to provide for the election of our representatives therein and other matters.

These three steps are not the scraps of paper of Wilson's fourteen points, the League of Nations, the Atlantic Agreement, the 26-nation agreement, the Rio Agreement. (If they grab at this straw.)

None were enforced and none can be enforced for the peace that all mankind wants and prays for.

These three steps are concrete, definite, enforceable, and create a world government with power to preserve peace.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to answer a statement that was made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I have just listened to the declaration of the gentleman from Michigan. I cannot accept, without challenge, one statement he made with respect to a man whom I have known for many years, a man who is my friend, a man who holds the respect of the bar of the State of New York, and is considered one of the most able prosecutors in the country, Mr. William Power Maloney. I am certain, although I have not had any occasion to discuss the question with him, that Mr. Maloney has never made any such statement as attributed to him by the gentleman from Michigan. I am certain that it is an untruth. I know that at

the proper time and in due course I shall be able to refute the serious implications of this unwarranted allegation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with the problem of surplus commodities and the C. C. C. camps.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by the United States attorney for the District of Columbia on the subject of Ireland's responsibility in the present war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an article by Col. J. E. Myers, retired.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized for 25 minutes.

CAPITALISM IN AMERICA IS ON TRIAL

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, capitalism in America is on trial. Those who desire the most to preserve the system are doing the most to destroy it. The lessons of history mean nothing to those who would destroy all the gains of organized labor won in the last 50 years. Under our kind of capitalism, labor is a partner and if the system is to work, a just balance between labor and capital must be the object of all national legislation.

To say now, when we are engaged in war, that labor must be stripped of its rights while capital goes its way with the blessing of the Government, would not only be a mistake, but would be the beginning of the end of capitalism in this country regardless of what any of our enemies can do.

The war has presented to capital and its blind supporters, hirelings, and sympathizers a grand opportunity to destroy in one blow all the gains of labor in a half century. It is not that these schemers are so concerned about our country, it is that they find this an opportune time to do what they have wanted to do for a generation—put the laboring class down where it will live on such crumbs as capital sees fit to hand it. Their theory is no doubt that with labor

castigated, more profits will be divided among the "more worthy."

Show me a Member of Congress who now is demanding the repeal of labor laws who was not—before the war—willing to undertake the same thing. The war has put an instrument in their hands with which to strike mightier blows at labor. Newspapers rush to the aid of these destroyers. But ask yourselves how many newspapers—daily papers—there are in the United States that do not receive the major part of their incomes from the business corporations of this country. These papers create public opinion and if a newspaper hammers away long enough on one subject, its readers will form the opinion that the paper wants formed. In this way there is more misinformation about labor laws in the United States than on any subject before the people for discussion today.

Labor alone is charged with the fact that we are not producing fast enough in the United States. Let us examine the whole case and see if organized labor is alone responsible for the defeats we have suffered in this war so far.

The first fact to start with is this:

The President of the United States is also the Commander in Chief of all our forces—Army, Navy, air, and submarine defenses. He says that the repeal of labor laws is not necessary. If he thought for 1 minute that labor was alone responsible for our defeats, is there any sane Member of this House who would say that the President would not act? I am not of the same political faith as the President—I cannot understand why he insists upon being a Democrat—but since we are in this war, I will be the last Member of this House to refuse to support the Commander in Chief.

Second. Those who are in charge of our war production say the repeal of labor laws is unnecessary. Do you suppose, from Donald Nelson down, these men would say the repeal of labor legislation is unnecessary if they were convinced that labor alone was responsible for our defeats? These men must know the facts, and where is there a Congressman on this floor who can state truthfully that labor is responsible for our losses thus far? We do not have the facts to prove this charge for the very good reason that the charge is false. Newspapers have gotten in their work—the paid press has carried out its orders—and many readers believe what they have read in print. Petitions, letters, and telegrams roll into every congressional office in Washington. Congressmen do not become alarmed over one letter or one telegram or one petition, but when they arrive in bundles and threaten to oust every last Congressman on the job if the labor laws are not suspended during the war, many Members get panicky and reecho what the paid press has said.

I can see no reason for all this panic; the worst that can happen to any Congressman is that he will be defeated and turned out to graze on a shorter pasture than that to which he is accustomed. Suppose he is defeated; the country will go on the same as ever; Congress will meet and adjourn the same as ever. I,

for one, refuse to be frightened by this method. First, I want to know the facts—not the opinions of the paid press, but the facts. I will then act and vote what I believe the facts warrant. Secondly, if the proof is that labor alone is responsible for our losses thus far, I will vote just like any other Member ought to vote—to put a stop to the interference of labor. That is my position on this matter, and no number of letters or telegrams or the threat of defeat will change my attitude. I propose to keep my mind clear to do the right thing when the entire case is presented to us. I am reminded of what Lincoln said:

I am not bound to win, but I am bound to be true. I am not bound to succeed, but I am bound to live up to what light I have. I must stand with anybody that stands right; stand with him while he is right and part with him when he goes wrong.

Third. There is too much misinformation in the country with respect to labor laws. The 40-hour week is merely a standard. For all concerned it was found better for both labor and capital to limit the number of hours to 40 per week. There are countless numbers of skilled-labor jobs where, to work men more than 8 hours per day, efficiency is broken, accidents increase, and defective work is produced.

Under the present law men can work over 40 hours per week. They are doing it right now in emergency cases. The following table tells the story.

Ninety percent of the shipbuilders are working 12 hours overtime per week.

Ninety-six percent of the men in the machine-tool industry are employed 56 hours per week.

Sixty-six percent of the engine builders are working 54 hours a week.

It is not a question of hours at all; it is a question of pay. For overtime, the laborer is paid time and one-half. It is merely a question of compensation.

In the face of constantly rising prices in the cost of living, it would not be justice to cut wages. The Bureau of Labor Statistics shows the index of 900 wholesale price lists 19 percent higher than a year ago.

Labor strikes alone are charged with being the cause of holding up production. The Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that a year ago the average time lost on account of strikes was 12 hours per man per year, and many of these strikes were called against union orders. The average hours worked would be approximately 52 hours per week per man. Fifty-two weeks would equal 2,704 hours, and strikes accounted for a loss of only 12 of these 2,704 hours.

When we get right down to the facts, anyone can see that the time lost on strikes is practically nothing when compared to a year's work.

In January of this year the time lost by strikes was six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the time actually worked. In February it was only eight one-hundredths of the total time worked. Besides this, of all the workmen involved in February strikes, 25 percent was accounted for in a single textile mill in New England.

The months of March and April will show, from present indications, a still smaller percentage of time lost.

The above record demonstrates conclusively that the time lost by labor was not the cause of the slowing down of production—even granting that it has slowed down.

Suppose we had wiped all labor laws from the statute books. Would we have had strikes? There is absolutely no doubt about it. England has declared strikes unlawful during the war, but the record shows more far-reaching strikes now than before Parliament passed the law.

Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Federal Works Agency Administrator, in arguing against repealing labor laws, said:

Industrial history proves that reasonable hours, fair working conditions, and a proper wage scale are essential to high production.

President Roosevelt, at his press conference on March 19, said that according to the National Safety Council, 460,000,000 man-days of productive effort were lost as a result of industrial accidents; 160,000,000 man-days were lost on account of common colds and other respiratory ailments; that the man-days lost by strikes were only 30,000,000. The following table, therefore, speaks volumes:

Man-days lost by accidents.....	460,000,000
Man-days lost by colds.....	160,000,000
Man-days lost by strikes.....	30,000,000

Strikes were responsible for 4.06 percent of lost time; other causes were responsible for 95.94 percent of lost time.

The charge is made that laborers get good wages and are not exposed to danger. I wonder if the workers are not subject to danger. During the past year there were 101,500 deaths as a result of industrial accidents and a further number of 350,000 were permanently disabled. From this record it would seem that our superpatriots, who never overlook an opportunity to snipe at labor, should take time out to check what labor is giving in this war.

It is obvious, without further argument, that had there been no labor laws upon the statute books, more men would have been killed and more injured by working overtime to such an extent that the human machine would be incapable of the alertness necessary in a dangerous calling. The amount of work performed per hour is more important than merely the number of hours put in. In skilled professions it is well known that the worker cannot be overtaxed without fatal results flowing from it. These results affect the worker and the employer and in the end losses all around come from the effort.

Fourth. Capital itself is not clamoring for the repeal of labor laws. Fortune magazine recently polled businessmen of managerial rank, and of the 5,000 replies received to this question, "What is the most important problem facing your business in the war years ahead?" only 7.8 percent named labor troubles and 41.2 percent named shortage of materials, effects of priorities, and allocations. The following table conclusively upholds this contention:

	Primary problem	Secondary problem	Total mentions
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Shortage of materials, effects of priorities and allocations. Government: Red tape, interference, indecision, war inefficiency, ultimate aims.....	37.4	3.8	41.2
Plant conversion or readaptation of organization to war needs.....	17.3	4.6	21.9
Shortage of necessary personnel.....	10.6	1.8	12.4
Finance: Reserves, investments, solvency.....	13.0	4.4	17.4
Reduced need for product or services.....	10.2	2.4	12.6
Labor problems, other than shortages, including wage rates, unions.....	5.3	1.1	6.4
Taxes.....	5.2	2.6	7.8
Research and post-war adjustments.....	4.8	2.7	7.5
Inflation.....	3.5	3.7	7.2
Transportation.....	2.2	1.8	4.0
Rising costs versus stabilized prices.....	1.9	1.5	3.4
Import and export stoppages.....	1.5	.1	1.6
Other answers.....	1.4	.2	1.6
	5.2	.3	5.5
Total, including multiple answers.....	119.5	31.0	150.5

Fifth. The profits made by industrialists on war contracts are a positive incentive to strikes. That these profits are in too many cases unconscionable and unjust the following facts will demonstrate: During 1941, 71 leading corporations handling war contracts increased their profits over 1939 and 1940 until last year showed an increase of 77 percent over 1939. Vultee Aircraft increased their profits 730 percent. Consolidated Aircraft increased theirs 472 percent; Bell Aircraft, 591 percent; Colorado Steel & Iron, 840 percent; Savage Arms, 233 percent; Interlake Iron, 190 percent; General Steel Castings, 190 percent; Sun Oil, 107 percent; and Aviation Corporation, 2,690 percent.

The evidence of greed and profit making is stupendous. Jack & Heintz Co. sold airplane motor starters to the Government for \$600 each, and then admitted to the Tolan committee that the starters cost only \$272.

These corporations are able to circumvent the law on excess-profits tax by paying unheard-of salaries and bonuses. United States Steel for 1941 put aside \$25,000,000, paid four times as much in taxes to the Government as they did in 1940, and then made a net profit of \$116,000,000.

The Basic Magnesium Co., on an investment of between \$25,000 and \$50,000, stands to make 4,280 percent in 1942, or \$2,140,000.

The Todd Shipbuilding Corporation made a profit margin of 62 percent on a recently completed Government contract. This corporation had 35,000 men working for them and their profit averaged \$1.80 per man per day.

Sixth. The laborers will not sell out their Government. Can as much be said for some of our greatest corporations? Have these corporations not restricted production; have they not boosted prices? Have they not refused to hand out their work to smaller factories with the hope that they could build up their own fac-

tories by Government subsidy? Have not dollar-a-year men favored their own concerns of origin to the detriment of all other manufacturers engaged in the same line of production? The Assistant Attorney General of the United States, Thurman Arnold, in his report to Congress, said:

There is not an organized basic industry in the United States which has not restricted production by some device or other.

Corporation salaries: We hear no complaints from the people about this matter, but we hear much about the fact that labor is paid more than the soldier. Let's look at the record. In the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, we find the following salaries paid by corporations: Twenty-nine men made salaries ranging from \$75,000 to \$442,560. In addition to this, these men shared in the profits of their own businesses, and in many instances received bonuses. Several, from all sources, made a million dollars annually. Even taking out the income tax on these salaries, the balance is an unconscionable amount, especially when our country is fighting for its life.

The report of the Securities Exchange Commission has something to say about bonuses. The salary of Dahlberg, president of the Celotex Corporation was listed at \$36,000, but his bonus for the year was \$157,871.98. G. W. Mason, president of Nash-Kelvinator, received a salary of \$125,731.07, but received bonuses aggregating \$100,000. Joseph W. Fraser, president, Willys-Overland Motors, received a salary of \$60,000 and a bonus of \$42,000.

Compare these salaries with the salaries paid our officers in the defense forces of the United States. Men like General MacArthur, who is giving his all in the defense of this country, receives less than \$10,000 annually. Compare MacArthur's salary with the men drawing down \$500,000 in industry.

Seventh. Labor is willing to give up all it has for the defense of the United States. No labor organization would even ask for pay and a half for overtime if the Government would benefit. But when the reduced pay rolls only swell the profits of the employer, labor kicks. Did anyone ever hear of a laborer with too much money? When he gets any he spends it, and all down the creek of business the grounds are watered.

A large percentage of the soldiers, probably 65 percent, come from the farms and from labor groups. Do you suppose the fathers of these boys are not patriotic; do you suppose they would wish this Nation defeated and all individual liberty lost? It is preposterous to think that labor is not patriotic. Do you suppose these men must be made peons while the corporations grow richer in order to win this war. My answer is "No."

It is the duty of Congress to establish a just relationship between labor and capital and make the combination work. If it will work in an emergency like the present—and I think it will—there will be all the more reason for doing justice to both now to the end that the close of the war may not see our economic system destroyed.

It is up to the Congress to insist that our system of government under capitalism shall actually work. We are contributing to disaster when we attack simply one element of our national system. If we insist on wiping off the statute books all protection to labor, and shut our eyes to the unconscionable profits of capital, we are well on the road to destruction. Two things can happen by this blind, unconsidered legislation. First, it will take the heart out of labor, and there will not be the incentive to action which we must have now. In the second place, in the long course of events the result will be the destruction of the entire capitalistic system.

When the Government destroys labor laws the next step will be the necessary taking over of all private industry by the Government. At no time could it be so easily done as now. When that has been done does anyone think the Government, that is, the people—would stand for the salaries and bonuses now being paid to business executives? The cry that the soldiers are fighting for \$21 per month, while labor demands overtime pay after 40 hours, would be met by the far greater cry that the most important leaders in this war—generals and admirals—are receiving less than \$10,000 annually while business executives are receiving in some instances \$500,000 and in rare instances close to a million dollars annually. What is good for the goose is good for the gander.

To deliberately set a wedge between capital and labor by destroying all labor rights would be to start a fight here at home by which our energies would be consumed and the way made easy for our enemies. If this Congress should wipe off the statute books all labor legislation, no better news could reach Germany and Japan. In these dark days we must take the system we have and make it work. Labor and capital must work together to supply what our forces need. It is the duty of Congress to keep a just and equitable balance between capital and labor, to the end that both elements shall have an incentive to sacrifice for their common country.

The proof is abundant that labor itself has through strikes had little effect on slowing up production as compared to other causes.

The stock argument of those who wish to abolish labor legislation is that every citizen should have the right to work without paying any organization a membership fee. Yes; if every citizen had that right, he would have the right to work for a pions pay. Those who take advantage of a labor organization should remember that for half a century this fight for a better day for the laborer has been going on. Better wages, better living conditions, safer equipment, the banishment of child labor, and more reasonable hours have been the result. A worker who now comes to work enjoys the fruits of the fight made by labor and should be glad to contribute to a cause that has made his job honorable and respectable and a job where he can live as a man and not a slave.

Just what is back of this vicious attack against labor I do not know. All other evils have been brushed aside, and no demand is made for anything except to repeal the labor laws of this country. I do not look upon this matter in the light of my own political interest, but in the light of what is right and just. The labor vote in North Dakota is small, but the facts demonstrate that labor is not to blame for our defeats. I have alined myself on the side of what I conceive to be right, and the political winds can blow.

Out of all this disturbance I trust many good things will come. If we can remain united as a people, with one object in view—to defeat our enemies—there is no combination of powers on earth that can defeat the United States. We may hear of losses and defeats for some time to come, but the moment we are supreme in the air we shall hear of victories. It took a long time to convince the people of this country that the air force was an indispensable asset in present-day warfare. The people know it now. They know that a battleship is absolutely useless without abundant air protection; they know now that defenses are of little avail without the protection of an air force. We are getting down to business now, and I do not believe we have slowed down in our defense production. We are turning out 3,300 fighting planes per month, and that number is constantly rising. Donald Nelson's latest report says:

The aviation schedule of 60,000 planes in 1942 is being met, and the tank output is ahead of schedule. The same thing is true of antitank and antiaircraft guns. A new era of management-labor cooperation is developing.

I predict that within 3 months we shall hear of victories, and if we can remain united here at home, our fighting forces will bring that victory that means so much for the entire people of the earth.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Right along the line the gentleman has been speaking about, I received a letter from the smelters at Anaconda, Mont., stating their opposition to any change in the labor laws and pointing out that the smelters were working 24 hours a day in 3 shifts of 8 hours each, and 48 hours a week, under the present system.

Mr. BURDICK. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does not the gentleman also feel that sometimes folks seem to lose sight of the fact that under the Selective Service Act every group in our population contributes its sons to the Army in exact proportion to the number of people belonging to that group? So when a distinction is made between labor as a group on the one hand and men in the armed forces on the other hand, there is not any more merit to making that distinction than there would

be in making a distinction between any other group and the men in the armed forces. The men in the armed forces come from the homes of labor, from the homes of farmers, and from the homes of everybody in the country, just the same.

Mr. BURDICK. I will say in answer to the gentleman that 65 percent of all the soldiers now serving in defense of this country come from the farms and from the labor groups—65 percent.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does the gentleman have any figures upon how many of those soldiers are carrying union cards?

Mr. BURDICK. No; I do not have the figures on that, but I know the fathers of these fellows are carrying union cards, and to say that a man is not patriotic just because he happens to be a farmer or a laborer, when his own boy is in the service, is something I cannot comprehend.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Who would make such a statement as that? I cannot imagine any man making such a statement.

Mr. BURDICK. It would take about 25 sheets of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to spread out a record of those who condemn labor because it is unpatriotic.

Mr. RICH. I would think there is something wrong with anyone who condemns labor as being unpatriotic, but there are men in labor unions that are doing things that the labor unions and the men in labor unions do not agree with and do not want to abide by, because they are so radical, and yet they have such a hand on labor that they are forcing labor to do things they do not want to do. Labor itself would not do such things if they could get free of their clutches.

Mr. BURDICK. I am giving here the reasons labor is not responsible.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman have facts and figures to show what percentage of profit has been made on the capitalization of the industries to which the gentleman has referred?

Mr. BURDICK. I have pointed out a few individual cases.

Mr. RICH. If I may ask the gentleman one further question, does the gentleman believe that the people in this Government who are giving out these contracts that would permit the exorbitant profits that have been made by some of these corporations were justified in awarding such contracts as would permit the making of such exorbitant profits?

Mr. BURDICK. No, I do not. That is shown by the statement I have made about the various companies.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman think the Government officials who are responsible for giving out contracts of that kind ought to be investigated to see whether there is something wrong, because, certainly, there is something wrong somewhere when they give a man a

contract out of which they make profits such as the gentleman has referred to.

Mr. BURDICK. I would not investigate the man, but I would investigate the system by which they enter into these contracts.

Mr. HOOK. I think that is the point, but is it not true that it is peculiar to all wars that there is a certain minority group that exacts a high price for co-operation?

Mr. BURDICK. Well, if they find a chance to make money easily.

Mr. COLE of New York. In regard to the Jack-Heintz matter, the criticism of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] was directed to the Navy Department for having entered into such an agreement. The fact is that this Jack-Heintz Co. was one of two makers of an item which the Government sorely needed. They demanded this high price of \$600 from the Government. The Government thought because of the urgency of the situation they needed the instrument, regardless of price. Then they later found that the price was exorbitant, and it was the Department itself which brought this matter to the attention of the Tolan committee, and as a result of that investigation the contracts have been renegotiated, and a surplus of some \$9,000,000 or more will be turned back to the Government. The price has been renegotiated to \$300. Therefore it is not the fault of the Navy officials for having entered into such an agreement.

Mr. BURDICK. Oh, I would not want to investigate any individual, because he is working under a system. If there is anything wrong, it is a wrong in the system under which the man is compelled to work.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Has the gentleman any information in respect to the pension that is paid to Mr. Walter Gifford by the Telephone Co., who draws a pension of \$60,000 a year at the expense of the stockholders and the telephone users of the United States?

Mr. BURDICK. I do not know that I have that particular name, but I have the whole system figured out. I suggest that we make a comparison of such salaries as that with the salary that is paid to a man like General MacArthur and a lot of generals now at the front, who receive less than \$10,000 a year. We have all heard it stated often on the floor. Look at the soldier serving for \$21 a month and compare that with a laborer at home who is getting \$16 a day. Well, why not compare the salary that General MacArthur gets, of \$9,000 a year, with the salary of a president of a concern who gets \$75,000 a year?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONROE). The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, on the part of others who have special orders, the Chair recognizes the gentleman for 2 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am interested in the gentleman's remarks, because I was looking over the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with reference to a certain Navy appropriation bill back in 1937, and I find where the gentleman and myself had made arguments along the same lines, that we could build a battleship for fifty or sixty or seventy million dollars that could be sunk in a second by a bomb from an airplane.

Mr. BURDICK. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks by inserting a speech made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] in Springfield, Mass., on last Friday evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONROE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the regular order of business and any other special orders, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow I may be privileged to speak for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a copy of a resolution passed by the Massachusetts State Automobile Dealers Association.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

LIVING CONDITIONS IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, what I want to address my remarks to is conditions existing in the city of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question but what conditions in Washington—those which we are forced to put up with to live and those under which our war program is being carried out by some of our leaders—are in many instances intolerable and are steadily growing worse. In fact they have reached a point where our very war effort is being seriously handicapped and delayed.

The stampede of pleasure seekers, chiselers, grafters, and those seeking fat Government contracts is growing daily, and the city is overflowing with these parasites, as President Roosevelt has so appropriately termed them.

I think the President was right when he stated that all these parasites should get out of Washington. To President

Roosevelt's parasites I want to add pleasure seekers, grafters, and chiselers. I think that Washington and the District of Columbia should be declared a war zone and those not directly connected with the Government and the war effort or essential business should be forced to get out for the duration.

Washington should not only be cleaned up but out, so that conditions would at least be livable and the operations of our Government could be carried on in a businesslike manner. Homes and apartment houses should be commandeered by the Government until the war is over. Naturally, the owners would be paid reasonable rentals.

No one should be allowed to enter the District without first having secured a certificate to show he was not a parasite but a person engaged in vital war and government work or who had legitimate business here. The whole war structure should be reorganized from the White House down the line so that our war effort could be carried out with but one thing—victory—in mind, and so that any person, a businessman or anyone else who was trying to help could come here, see the people he wanted, transact his business in a few days and get back home. As it is now he is shoved from one Government agency to another; from one petty official to another. No one knows just what he is doing or why; no one seems to have any authority, and the buck passing, lack of coordination, lack of centralized authority, overlapping agencies, useless bureaus, and wasted effort going on here is enough to make the ordinary citizen shudder with despair. It no doubt makes our enemies shout with glee. In many ways official Washington is really helping Japan and Germany win this war right here in Washington.

Those people who are here doing their bit come from the four corners of the United States, by far the majority from places where climatic conditions are at least livable. It is bad enough to live in Washington under normal conditions. Even the chamber of commerce, I think, will admit that Washington's climate is about the most miserable in the country. What is going to happen to this sweltering mass of humanity in our offices, rooms, apartment houses, and on the streets and trolleys this summer when temperatures hit 90 and 100 and the humidity goes up to 60 or 70?

With people packed in here like sardines, almost anything could and probably will happen. Think of the tragedy if Washington were to be bombed or an epidemic break out. Living conditions for those who are here doing their best to help win this war should be the best, not the worst, in the country. I know of instances where people engaged in war work here are seeking a way to honorably get out of this madhouse.

I do not have to tell you our boys are being slaughtered on land and on sea. We have the finest fighting men in the world. They are ready to die and are dying for their country and to protect you and me.

The eyes of these boys are turned on Washington for guidance, for protection,

to see that the flow of weapons and ammunitions is undiminished.

And what do these boys see? They see a city of chaotic conditions. A city bursting with red tape and gold braid, captain's bars and general's stars. A city overflowing with pleasure seekers, grafters, chiselers, and other parasites.

Where was official Washington when our battered, bleeding, starving troops on Bataan scanned the skies and the seas for planes and ships which never came? "Give us just a few planes," was their plea. "Give us just a little equipment and we will hold our own."

My God, gentlemen, where was official Washington during all this? At a cocktail party? Being photographed? Or trying to decide whose responsibility it was to get aid to these brave men?

Clark Lee, an Associated Press correspondent who has been recording the history of the battle of the Philippines through his dispatches, wrote on April 11 and I quote, in part:

Equipment available to the defenders proved its worth, but there was not enough of it. The Army seemed to have only one or two pieces of the United States most modern equipment—one radio direction finder, one fully equipped antiaircraft battery, one squadron of torpedo boats, one group of mounted 75's.

Is not that the most awful thing you ever heard of? Those responsible for this shameful shortage of equipment should be charged with treason. Think of our brave men fighting hundreds of thousands of Japs with this kind of stuff. We should bow our heads in shame.

These boys also look to Washington and see a city where legitimate businessmen who are doing their very best to help this country and this Government shoved from one official to another; from one agency to another, for days, weeks, and even months. It is enough to fill the most patriotic American with disgust.

I wish every Member of this House would read the article entitled "Are We Awake—Even Yet?" in the April issue of the Reader's Digest. It is a bitter indictment of the Capital City of these United States.

I quote some of the more pertinent passages:

The set-backs of the United States in the first months of the war have reflected not so much military failure as an intellectual failure. We have not been out-fought but out-manuevered and out-thought.

Yet despite this catalog of catastrophe, despite the fact that everybody says we have learned a terrible lesson, there is no general agreement on what that lesson is; and one ventures to inquire whether even now we have cleared our minds of old ideas, habits, and prejudices, whether as a Nation we are awake to the grim realities of war.

In the year 1941 we turned out \$20,000,000,000 worth of peacetime goods with machines which could have been converted to war work . . .

Hope Ridings Miller, society editor of the Washington Post, reported the other day: "This town recently has given itself over to the most hectic round of partying anybody has ever heard of."

The author, James B. Reston, a New York Times correspondent here, goes on to recite many of Washington's weaknesses.

But just imagine the Capital of the United States in the time of war "Giving itself over to the most hectic round of partying anybody has ever heard of."

The war and Government workers are doing the best they can under the circumstances. Rooms are almost impossible to find. Those that can be rented are priced so outrageously high that many cannot afford to meet the demands of the landlords. Hundreds, after a short stay here, find conditions so rotten that they turn around and go home in despair and disgust.

"There's lots of rooms in the outlying districts," the Civil Service Commission says. But who can afford to pay transportation charges back and forth each day, or who is going to spend 1, 2, or 3 hours a day going back and forth from work after working 10 or 12 hours?

How would Members of this House like to live in Washington on \$1,440 a year and try to eat, sleep, pay transportation, insurance, dental and doctor bills, buy clothes, meet other incidental expenses, go to a show once in a while, and save a few dollars for war bonds? You would say it was impossible. It is impossible under the conditions which exist in Washington.

Hotels and rooming houses are crammed full. Some of these persons are legitimate Government workers; hundreds are pleasure seekers; many are after fat Government contracts or commissions in the Army or Navy; others are here just to see the crowds and the excitement. In this latter group are the rich, those who can afford to pay Washington's prices, get the most livable rooms and the best meals; hundreds of thousands of others cannot.

Hotels do not care whether they rent you a room or not. You can take it or leave it. Hotels will not give monthly or weekly rates, but charge by the day, apparently with the idea that if you do not stay long they can raise the price to the next party who comes along.

Restaurants are overcrowded. You cannot get a decent meal without waiting from half an hour to an hour and a half. The cry of the restaurant owners is, "Get 'em at a table, get the most money you can for the least food, and get 'em out as soon as you can to make room for someone else."

Conditions in the kitchens where this mass of food is prepared must be anything but sanitary. They could not be otherwise.

Waiters and waitresses in countless places, especially where thousands of our Government workers are forced to eat, serve food while wearing indescribably dirty uniforms. Dishes are washed—or rather half-washed—and filthy garbage is carted away under your very nose.

Half the time you cannot get a cab. Streetcars are so full of perspiring, worn-out Government workers that many prefer to walk in spite of the vast distances.

Washington grocery stores, drug stores, clothing shops, and others, in hundreds of instances, have doubled prices since the boom began. Low-paid families find it impossible to eat decently because of the prices charged.

Price Administrator Leon Henderson has placed ceilings on everything but the very things that people must have to live—food, clothing, drugs, and a place to sleep. This is the most asinine thing I ever heard of. Food prices, drug and clothing prices go upward and upward in a never ending spiral and Henderson and our other Government leaders sit placidly by and do nothing, or at the most go to a cocktail party, or take a vacation.

The Washington idea of winning this war seems to be to get yourself a nice fat Government job, like that of Price Administrator. Then you call in the press and the photographers and issue a bunch of fine-sounding statements on what you are going to do to win this war in the next couple of months. Then you get yourself photographed sitting down, standing up, smiling, looking grimly, seriously, shaking hands, and in every other conceivable pose. Then comes a round of high-powered cocktail parties at which thousands of Japs and Germans are killed. The most masterful diplomatic coups in the world are made. In fact, the very war is won and peace is declared over these Martinis and whisky sours.

The next step on this Washington road to success is to pull out for a much needed rest in South America or some other country, forgetting, of course, that this Nation of ours is at war and is confronted with the greatest crisis in history.

If Henderson had to go to South America for a much-needed rest this winter, just where in the h— will he and the others go this summer when it gets hot here and there is even more work to be done and more vital decisions to be made?

I approve of what the author, James B. Reston, of *Are We Awake—Even Yet*, says in the Reader's Digest, and I quote:

This is not intended to give the impression that Government officials do nothing but attend parties. Most of them work early and late. But they cannot escape a great number of these social affairs, and the atmosphere of Washington is not yet one of grim, relentless war work.

This social whirl is part of the same mentality that causes some of the highest-ranking Cabinet secretaries and other top officials to squander their energy, ingenuity, and time in maneuvering for position.

People tell me that many Washington citizens are buying new homes with 3 or 4 extra bedrooms and are renting these rooms out at \$20, \$25, \$30, and even more a month. They are paying for these homes by gouging Government workers. All the way from 2 or 3 persons to 15 or 20 persons, according to newspaper stories, are using a single bathroom. If that is not an intolerable condition, I would like to know what is.

If Washington was to be declared a war zone, and those not connected with the Government and the war effort were chased out, these proposed vast housing projects would not be needed. It would not be necessary to spend millions of dollars in Government money for these buildings which will be empty and useless after the war.

The battle cry of Washington seems not to be "Let's cut out the red tape and the politics and get together and win this war," but "Let's soak them all. Let's

have politics as usual. Let's have our fun and our vacations. War is fun. It may not last long. Long live prosperity!"

When will official Washington realize there is a war to be won? This war cannot be won by talking and making headlines or at cocktail parties and banquets. It cannot be won by red tape, "buck passing," and shifting responsibility. But it can be won by full cooperation, hard-headed thinking, drastic decisions, and an all-out effort.

Official Washington had better wake up. Wake up before it is too late.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. Does not the gentleman think we have got plenty of room out in Montana and in the western part of the United States for these people?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Oh, God bless them, I wish they could all come to Montana. They would work for nothing if they could be out there in that salubrious climate, which makes the old young and the young continue young and abounding with life and energy; where every night they would sleep under a blanket; where the stately mountain peaks vie with each other for the first rays of the early morning sun; where the snow-covered mountains reach so high they pierce the clouds and kiss the feet of the angels as they are floating over the clouds.

Where the broad expanse of the western plains begin at the rushing river's edge and go spreading back to the very feet of the pine-covered mountains on either side; where the beautiful, graceful antelope, the timid, fleeting deer, the rugged bear, and the stately elk may still be seen despite the advances of the white man's civilization.

Where the ice-cold, crystal-clear streams have their birth at the foot of mammoth, glistening white glaciers, to continue their way through fertile valleys to join the muddy Missouri; where the wily trout defy the efforts of the most skillful anglers to get them into their creels; where the eastern tourist sees vast fields of waving grain, green alfalfa fields, meadows hip deep with wild hay, the broad expanses of the sugar-beet fields, and the thousands of head of white-faced beef cattle, as well as millions of sheep.

Would that this great Capital of these United States could be moved to this matchless paradise—but you have diverted me.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to start that at all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobbs] is recognized for 20 minutes.

STATE TAXATION OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard the story of the flea and the elephant. The circus was coming to town and the flea on the elephant's ear naturally went across with the elephant upon a bridge which was thereby caused to shake dangerously. As he got across on the other side, after his terror had

subsided, he whispered into the ear he was biting, "Oh, big boy, didn't we shake it?"

There are any number of instances of such confused thinking. Whenever any flea bites afflict any part of our body politic there are always persons who assert the claim of the flea on the elephant's ear.

I refer specifically and ask your attention to the bill H. R. 6750, a bill which, in my reasoned judgment, is one of the most terrific in its implications of danger to our form of government that this Nation has ever seen. It is with profound regret that I note that it has the stamp of approval of one of the greatest committees of this Congress, the Ways and Means Committee. Let me read you what it states:

To promote the prosecution of war by exempting from State, Territorial, and local taxes the sale, purchase, storage, use, or consumption of tangible personal property and services for use in performing defense contracts—

That is in the title. In section 1 of title I it provides that such taxes shall be outlawed and that any defense contractor shall be exempt from State, Territorial, county, municipal, and other local taxes, and any such taxes imposed by Puerto Rico and the Philippine Islands or any political subdivision thereof.

In section 201 of title II it further provides:

After the effective date of title I of this act—

Listen to this, Mr. Speaker—

No State, Territory, or political subdivision thereof shall make claim for, collect, or receive any tax of a type with respect to which an exemption is provided by title I hereof which has accrued subsequent to the declaration of national emergency made by the President on September 8, 1939.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Gladly.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is this the so-called Cochran bill?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. With pleasure.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Would not the gentleman say that under that part of the bill a contractor who had been awarded a contract on the basis of accruing State sales taxes would thereby be the beneficiary of such an exemption?

Mr. HOBBS. A bid contractor would, of course; it would be to his advantage; the Government would get no benefit out of it whatever, to the contrary a financial detriment. There is a provision in the bill, however, which attempts to correct that. Whether it does or not, I am not prepared to say. May I lay down for your thoughtful consideration a few propositions which no one can deny. I am not going into any lengthy discussion, but I will give you the citation of authorities upon which I base my statements in the course of my remarks.

The first proposition I want to lay down is that immunity of the Federal Government from State taxation of any

kind is unquestionable. Our friend, David Lawrence, in his informative column, which is usually as accurate as any, says:

Any one or all of the 48 States may tax the Army and Navy war contracts.

There has never been a word in the history of jurisprudence or declaration of law by any supreme court of any standing that agrees with that; the truth is just the reverse.

He says that:

The War and Navy Departments have been blocked by the Treasury Department, which looks at the matter from its own departmental standpoint. It has been planning to raise revenue by taxing the income from State and municipal bonds and, naturally, does not wish to be impairing any other sources of State revenue.

This may be where we see the colored gentleman in the woodpile; in other words, that may be where we begin to get down to the milk in the coconut.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HOBBS. I shall be delighted to yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. What impressed me—and I want to say that I am in full agreement with the expressions of the gentleman from Alabama on this bill, the contractor takes into consideration the question of the sales tax, or the gross income tax, or whatever tax there is in the State at the time he bids on the contract; and if he should be exempt from the payment of that tax it would not inure to the benefit of the Government at all, it would be his personal profit on the contract.

Mr. HOBBS. I answered that in reply to the gentleman from Washington. That may or may not be an accurate statement. There is an attempt in this bill to correct such an injustice. I refer to the proviso in section 1.

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Gladly.

Mr. PITTINGER. Is it not a fact that where an industry comes into a district and sets up a defense plant it throws additional burdens on the municipality for school facilities, roads, and so forth?

Mr. HOBBS. That is undoubtedly true; and, of course, police protection has to be extended, fire protection, and other municipal services; but that is not the burden of my song or the point I am making. I do not think such considerations should be included, because the Federal Government is making rather liberal appropriations of the taxpayers' money to compensate the States for those damages and is giving the States by location of defense or war industries the benefits that derive naturally from their location. Therefore, I do not agree with the gentleman on that point, that that is one of the damning points against this bill. There may be merit in the contention, I am not saying there is not; but that is not any part of what I am seeking to call to the attention of Congress.

My point is that the Federal Government, no matter what this Congress might say, cannot be subject to State taxation.

Mr. PITTENGER. Does not the gentleman think in connection with legislation that has such far-reaching and uncertain possibilities as this legislation, there ought to be more than just a few departmental heads appear before a committee and testify? It is my understanding that the public generally has not been invited to attend these hearings and give testimony for or against this measure.

Mr. HOBBS. There again, though I have the highest regard and respect for the distinguished gentleman with whom I have had the pleasure of serving on one of the great committees of this House for a year, I cannot agree with him. I do not believe we should have had more but fewer witnesses.

I am shocked, grieved, and horrified that any man should have espoused this bill either on the floor or before the Ways and Means Committee. It is a terrible indictment of this Congress that such a bill should be seriously considered. To say that the Congress of the United States should arrogate to itself the right to say to a sovereign State, "Thou shalt" or "Thou shalt not tax one of thine own citizens" is too preposterous to consider seriously. You cannot by exemption defeat the power of the sovereign States to tax. You cannot say that the States can or cannot tax. They are the source of our taxing power. They are the ones from whom we derive our power, limited as it is. The tenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States is our brief. We should not have to say a word on that subject.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be so happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I understand this bill, and I think this is a point that ought to be made clear in the understanding of the people, this is not to free the Federal Government from taxation by States. In other words, any property that the Federal Government buys now is not subject, as I understand it, to those taxes if the Federal Government itself buys it.

Mr. HOBBS. Of course not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. This goes much further and relates to the contractor who is simply performing a work as an independent contractor for the Federal Government?

Mr. HOBBS. That is right.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Has it not always been true that the independent contractor paid these taxes?

Mr. HOBBS. Of course.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No objection has even been raised until now, even though during all these years they have been performing under just such an arrangement as this?

Mr. HOBBS. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am not an attorney, as the distinguished gentleman knows, and perhaps I approach this matter from a little different

point of view. I would like to ask the gentleman this question.

Mr. HOBBS. I welcome the gentleman's question.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does the gentleman believe that in times such as the present, when to such a great extent we are called upon over and over again to furnish Federal funds for the meeting of various problems throughout the country, it is most unwise policy to cut off a source of State revenue, and then run the risk that because of having done that there may be an increased dependence upon Federal revenues to take care of governmental needs?

Mr. HOBBS. I certainly do, but I do not want to be misunderstood. I flatly deny that the Federal Government has any such power. It has not. While I believe it would be unwise for it to exercise that power if it had it, I do not want to get away from my major thesis, which is that it has no such power.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. I am interested in the gentleman's statement, because I originally opposed this bill myself. Does not the gentleman feel that if the principle involved in this bill is established it practically makes the State subservient to the Federal Government?

Mr. HOBBS. Of course, it will. The gentleman is exactly right.

Now I must decline to yield further, as much as I love to be courteous and generous, until I have finished my statement, because all of these questions are right in line with my thinking. I beg the loan of your ears for a few minutes until I can conclude my statement.

The second proposition is that Congress may waive this immunity, but it has to do it by a clear and unequivocal act of the legislature.

The third is equally indisputable. No assertion of this immunity is necessary. I want you to get your teeth into that. Every one of these propositions is backed by a long and unbroken line of Supreme Court decisions to the effect that no assertion whatsoever is necessary to give the Federal Government immunity from State taxation.

Going further than my distinguished colleague from Alabama asked me to go, and where I was glad to go with him, going much further than that, not only is the Federal Government exempt but any agency of the Federal Government is also exempt from State taxation. There need be no assertion of immunity whatever. It rises from the fountainhead of our rights of this kind and is found in the Constitution itself. Therefore, unless clearly waived, Federal immunity obtains, and nothing that Congress can do may change it. In other words, we can by our action waive constitutional immunity if we see fit to do so. We have done nothing of the kind here. Therefore, the Federal Government needs no change of law but merely requires a simple change in the form of contracts.

All you need is to designate a contractor in one of these war industries as

the agent of Uncle Sam, which he is—essentially and truly he is nothing else—simply designate him as the agent for the construction of this cantonment, this powder plant, this shell-loading plant, or what not. That is what he is. Why not say so?

Let me give you an illustration of this case in point. King & Boozer, a lumber dealer in Anniston, Ala., is a contractor on a cost-plus fixed-fee basis. Go to King & Boozer and say, "We want to buy some lumber from you for the construction of a cantonment." They will say, "All right; be glad to sell it to you f. o. b. the delivery point," which is the point of construction on the reservation at Fort McClellan. The contract provides in so many words that immediately upon delivery title to the lumber delivered passes to the Federal Government, and that nothing that can be done by the contractor in charge is valid without the approval of the local constructing quartermaster, an officer of the Army. The location of the delivery, I mean the point on the ground where it shall be delivered, and everything else, is under the exclusive control of the Federal Government. Yet they say that these contractors are not agents of the Federal Government.

Then they go ahead and say in that contract, and the contractor shall pay all costs of assembling this material, including State taxes, and we, the Government, will refund those costs including taxes and anything else that you pay out in accordance with this contract.

Can you imagine anything plainer? It is just indisputable that those contractors are the agents of the Federal Government. Yet all we need to do is to say so, and immediately there is no controversy whatever as to the bomb-proof immunity from State, county, municipal, or any other taxation.

The Supreme Court of Alabama said in its decision that we should look through form to substance. Essentially we know that this tax is paid as a State tax by the Federal Government in the way of a refund. We are at war, and Uncle Sam is building a cantonment to train our soldiers. Essentially he foots the bill and, therefore, is exempt from taxes of any kind by the State, county, or any municipality. The Supreme Court of Alabama was overruled by the Supreme Court of the United States on that point. We are still at war, and will not, because of our repugnance to the idea of change, change the nomenclature in our contracts to make these men who are our agents, our agents. Do that and the problem is solved, and you need not try to kill the sovereign States.

Please let me read you a most excellent letter I received from one of the best lawyers I know. While I am not convinced, as he is, that the decision of the Supreme Court of Alabama was wrong and that the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States was right in reversing the decision of the Supreme Court of Alabama in the recent cases, nevertheless, I commend his statement of fundamental principles underlying both decisions:

The decisions in the so-called *Alabama cases* (*King & Boozer v. State*, 3 So. (2d) 572;

and *United States et al v. Curry, Commissioner of Revenue*, 3 So. (2d) 582; and *Alabama v. King and Boozer*, 314 U. S. 1), made no change in the rule of intergovernmental tax immunity, but rightly held that an independent contractor was not entitled to be construed as an agent and was, therefore, necessarily required to pay any lawful taxes imposed upon him with respect to any activity in which he was engaged, or for any privilege which he might exercise in his own name for profit.

In the hearings before the committee, it is suggested that the Supreme Court, in the decisions in the Alabama cases, clearly indicated "that Congress had the power to enact legislation of this character." What the Supreme Court said is as follows:

Congress has declined to pass legislation immunizing from State taxation contractors under cost-plus contracts for the construction of governmental projects. Consequently the participants in the present transaction enjoy only such tax immunity as is afforded by the Constitution itself, and we are not now concerned with the extent and the appropriate exercise of the power of Congress to free such transactions from State taxation of individuals in such circumstances that the economic burden of the tax is passed on to the National Government. The Government, rightly we think disclaims any contention that the Constitution, unaided by congressional legislation, prohibits a tax exacted from the contractors merely because it is passed on economically by the terms of the contract or otherwise, as a part of the construction cost of the Government. So far as such a nondiscriminatory State tax upon the contractor enters into the cost of the materials to the Government, that is but a normal incident of the organization within the same territory of two independent taxing sovereignties. The asserted right of the one to be free of taxation by the other does not spell immunity from paying the added costs, attributable to the taxation of those who furnish supplies to the Government and who have been granted no tax immunity.

You will note that Mr. Chief Justice Stone very aptly used the terms "immunizing" and "immunity," and that no reference was made to any right of the Federal Government to prescribe or grant exemptions to any one from the payment of State taxes. Yet this seems to be the approach and purpose of the bill.

The history of the matter is that Congress having refused to pass legislation authorizing the contractors to act as agents for the National Government in making purchases of material left them in a status necessarily subject to State taxation. It is logical, therefore, to conclude that what the Supreme Court had in mind was that unless the contractors were granted authority to act as such agents, rather than in their own names, they could not enjoy any immunity from State taxation. Of course, if the Government purchased in its own name, or by and through the duly authorized agent acting in the capacity as agent rather than as an independent contractor, as indicated by the Court, such transaction would be free from State taxation for the reason that the purchase would be correctly construed as having been made for the principal and, therefore, entitled to immunity of the Government.

It seems to me that there has been a misconception of the Court's meaning,

for the right of the State to tax an individual who acts in his own name for private profit, and not as an authorized agent, is a right expressly reserved to the States under the Constitution—article X.

It is not enough to say that the Constitution and the laws enacted pursuant thereto are the supreme laws of the land, if such laws are designed to destroy the right of a State to collect its lawful revenue, "the lifeblood of the State."

As expressed by Mr. Chief Justice Marshall in the case of *McCulloch v. Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316), "the power to tax involves the power to destroy." However, the right to prevent taxation equally involves the power to destroy.

For instance, if the Congress may exempt citizens of a State from the payment of their otherwise lawfully imposed tax burden merely because Congress determines that an indirect benefit will ensue to the National Government, there would be no end to the possible exercise of the power of Congress to exempt from State taxation. For instance, better to secure the repayment of Government obligations, the citizens might be exempted from the payment of any taxation to the State. Better to enable a contractor to perform a contract, the exemptions from State taxation might be extended to any and all forms of taxation which Congress determines constitute an interference with his ability to perform a contract.

In a time of war, it will be difficult to find any business which could not establish some facts to show a substantial connection with or furtherance of the national program. Especially would this be true if we devote all of our efforts to winning the war.

It is not sufficient to say that the bill is enacted in furtherance of the prosecution of the war, for the following reasons:

(a) Purchases made by the Government, directly or through its agents, are already immune from all State taxation, unless consent to tax has been expressly granted by the Congress.

(b) If the Government prefers to follow the procedure of the employment of independent contractors, there is no more delay or interference involved in permitting the contractor to pay the State tax than is involved in his own transactions under private contracts. Certainly, a mere detail of checking the items involved in accomplishing reimbursement for both the price of the goods and the tax is not sufficient to justify a drastic interference with the operation of the State's system of taxation.

(c) When the question was first considered by Congress, it was recognized that the immunity of the National Government could not be extended to cover purchases made by contractors in their own names and upon their own credit, operating for private gain—the percentage of compensation being partly based upon the amount of purchases—and, therefore, it was proposed to authorize the contractors to act as agents for the Government in making purchases of materials. This proposal was defeated, but its enactment would immunize such transactions without the violation of any

constitutional rights of the States. Such action would not seriously affect the State's revenues, nor the State's system of taxation.

The present proposal is apparently designed to relieve not only the Government itself directly, but all of the contractors, manufacturers, transportation companies, and utilities from the payment of various State taxes, merely because the economic burden thereof will indirectly or eventually become a part of the cost of prosecuting the war.

When we realize that every major activity may be converted to a direct or an indirect war effort, if Congress undertakes to prevent any form of State taxation from becoming a part of the cost of the war effort, there would be no limit to the national interference with the State fiscal program. Even the present proposal would doubtless so seriously affect some States as to soon cause a default in outstanding obligations.

Surely the problem may be solved with proper consideration to both the National and State problems involved. There is no limitation upon the credit or taxing powers of the National Government, in the exercise of the war powers, and, therefore, fiscal reasons alone would not seem to justify a far-reaching interference with, even a confiscation of, the State's sources of revenue. While all that the State has may, if necessary, be taken to win the war, the Constitution contemplates just compensation.

If the States' reserved powers of taxation have no constitutional protection against the exercise of the war powers of the National Government, the States may easily be discredited and made impotent in their attempt to preserve their sovereignty and enforce their laws; and if the war powers justify such national legislation, other Federal powers may likewise be made the basis of further encroachments upon the rights of the States to impose the various forms of taxation upon privately owned property, and various activities exercised by private citizens for profit, because of an indirect effect upon some phase of the national program.

Such a course may eventually be more disastrous to our dual system of democratic government than we may now visualize. The States may neither coin money nor readily replace the loss of revenues if every major source of production is, as it should be, converted to the production of the essentials for the successful prosecution of the war; and, therefore, the National Government which alone may cope with the unusual financial strain of war should not directly or indirectly destroy the efficiency of the State governments. There would be no counterbalancing benefit, and the States would have no alternative source from which to replenish revenues necessary to continue the protection of their credit or the performance of essential State functions and services.

The inexorable logic of Chief Justice Marshall in the case of *McCulloch v. Maryland et al.* (4 Wheat. 361, 431) laid the foundation and erected the main superstructure of the legal temple of intergovernmental tax immunity. This was in 1819. But from that day to this,

what he then wrote remains the law. It is just as true today as it was then:

That the power to tax involves the power to destroy.

It is equally true that the power to exempt persons, classes, or subjects from the operation of a tax involves the power to destroy the power which levied the tax.

A State of the American Union is either sovereign in the realm of undelegated taxing power or it is not. It can no more be subject to Federal control in this realm of its reserved taxing power than the Federal Government can be subject to State control within its recognized sphere of supremacy.

Never before in the history of American law has there been so bold an assertion of the hitherto unclaimed alleged right of the Federal Government to invade the sacred precincts of the undoubted right of the sovereign States to tax as they may see fit within their respective fields of their undelegated taxing powers. This bill, H. R. 6750, is so novel in this respect that it would be amusing were it not so lethal in its threat of destruction of the undelegated sovereign power of taxation in the States, yea, destruction of the very life of the States.

Of course, no such preposterous claim would be asserted but upon the shallow theory of wartime necessity. But this argument, plausible though it may seem at first blush, falls of its own weight when examined in the light of reason. The existence of any national emergency or of war itself does not nor can it change the structure of our Government. It neither adds to nor subtracts from the reserved powers of the States nor those delegated to the Federal Government. The Supreme Court of the United States has so frequently enunciated this axiom of law as to render the citation of authority unnecessary. It is manifestly no more permissible nor pardonable to transcend the limits of Federal power in war than in peace. Beyond the limit of Federal power there is no power, and any attempted assertion to the contrary is usurpation.

It has been suggested that this is but the first step of encroachment leading to the tenuous claim of the reciprocal right in the Federal Government to tax State, county, and municipal bonds. This is reasonable and may be so. But two wrongs never made a right—one rape never justifies another.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE LESSON OF BATAAN

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 9, 1942, the evening newspaper bore the headline "36,000 American and Filipino soldiers face death or capture on Bataan."

I could see their faces, bleeding and ghastly and their eyes burning with a fierce determination and a tinge of bitterness. To some other people they were a segment of the American Army that

had with brilliant and heroic success fought a delaying action on that peninsula. But to themselves they were living individual human beings, young men who had not made the world what it was and who wanted to live as much as anyone. And all night I could feel their breath on my face and it was full of strength and sweat and tiredness.

The only thing I could think of was Herman Hagedorn's poem—especially the last lines which go like this:

We dead keep watch! You shall not sleep nor rest

We died. And now you others who must live Shall do a harder thing than dying is— For you shall think! And ghosts shall drive you on!

And I did think. I thought about how I had voted for the Selective Service Act and how some of those men on Bataan would not have been there if Congress had not passed that law. True, I did not see then and I do not know now what else we could have done. And I thought about how I had voted for going to war after Pearl Harbor—how, along with all the rest of the Congress I had voted for war because there just was nothing else we could have honorably done. But I also thought of the years that had followed the World War—how the world had slipped and slid from one tragic mistake to another because there was no real leadership for a constructive, strong peace, how if there had been such leadership those men on Bataan might not be dying, and all this might not have happened. The cleanness of our country's cause under all the circumstances I did not and do not for a moment doubt. But those men on Bataan were saying to me that there had been years when something better could have been done; they were saying that a way should have been found; and they were saying that they had folks that would miss them and long for them through dreary years if they died; and they were saying that there was one thing men like them would not stand for again. And that was failure to win this war which they had so nobly begun and then to really establish peace.

Hitler is an evil force. His government is an oppressive, heartless state. Japan's military are an evil force. Their government is an oppressive, heartless state within a state. But no reason, no logic, no explaining why does any good. The blood of those men on Bataan is on my hands just as it is on the hands of every person who has ever had the least position of responsibility or leadership since World War No. 1. It is on the hands of every man who ever made a speech that was not a good enough speech, or ever tried to correct the things that have been wrong with the world and failed to do it.

We are filled not only with a profound admiration and gratitude but with remorse and sorrow. It would not be too much to say that as we think of their story we are heartbroken. We shall give them heroes' places in all the American history books of the future. But it is not enough. Only one thing will be enough. Only one thing. And that is that "these dead shall not have died in vain," as Lincoln put it.

Bataan could not be relieved. General Wainwright and his white and brown soldiers could not be helped without killing countless other men like them. Undoubtedly those things are true. I do not know anything about military strategy. But I do know those of us who could not relieve them, who were told we had to leave them there have got to live in sight of their bloodshot eyes, in sound of their voices, and in reach of their breath until we remake the world. Yes; we have got to live that way until this war is won. But more than that we have got to live that way until a peace far, far stronger than the last peace has been built and until a world enough better than this world, enough better than the world of 1918-39, has been wrought out so that young men can live and have hope again. The men of Bataan, whether they lie there much too quietly or whether they go to spend bitter days in Japanese prison camps, have done their part and more. That better peace and that better world they have helped to make possible. But they cannot build them. Neither can anyone who is not in mind and spirit close, indeed, to what those men went through.

The only kind of men who can make that kind of peace and build that kind of world are men who cannot and will not escape for even an hour from the searing glance of those American and Filipino men who died upon Bataan Peninsula.

May God give us such men. I have faith He will.

Mr. Speaker, as I look at this epic of American heroism I am impelled to give voice to certain things which I see possibly impending in the future. Our country and the nations with which we fight have suffered certain defeats. It is no wonder. Any free people operates inevitably under certain handicaps when confronted by enslaved people at war. Our strength will come when our spirit is strong to meet all things. I do not think we have yet met the most severe blow. I do not know when it may come, but it is hard for me to believe that dictatorships like the Nazi dictatorship and like the Japanese have not laid plans deep enough and clever enough so that some day in the future our country will be wracked by attacks such as we have not yet seen. Just when it will come I do not know, neither does anybody else. I pray God it will not come, but I think it important that our people be braced for the possibility that on a day previously prepared these people may strike—strike through sabotage in certain places in our Nation. I know our F. B. I. and our Army and Navy intelligence are the best in the world, and certainly up to date they have done a remarkably effective job. I think their toughest days lie yet ahead. What I fear is that a spirit of criticism of the other fellow—I am not talking about an administration, but I am talking about a spirit on the part of one group of people saying everything would be all right if only that bunch over there were doing its part, and the spirit of the other group saying that everything would be all right if certain other fellows would do their part. This can grow. It can be fostered. It is possible to foster a spirit of uncertainty and confusion of

suspicion and distrust among us. It is possible that further victories will be won by Germany and Japan, and it may be then that the darkest hour yet will come on our country. I want us to be ready for it because out of that darkest hour will emerge a Nation even stronger than we have ever been before, a Nation that can feel the breath of men who died on Bataan on its very face, as most of our people do now. And Hitler, however clever his plans may be, and however far they may go, and wherever they may strike, is not going to be able to rock this country. We will pass through it and we will pass through it safely and we will pass through it stronger than we were before. I say these things also because I believe it important for people around the world to know that America is prepared to do whatever she needs to do in these darkest hours.

A singleness of purpose on the part of every single soul in Washington will awaken that same singleness of purpose throughout this Nation. It is simply not true that men and women in the Government lack devotion or earnestness, but I am not so sure but what the people are ahead of Washington in this respect even now. I am sure that as realization of the meaning of some of these disasters comes to them they will become not embittered, but they will learn, as you and I must learn, that we pass now through the valley of the shadow of death for democracy itself and that the hope of the future lies in our preparation for whatever may be in store for us.

I have not one shadow of doubt in my mind about what the final outcome of this struggle will be. The reason I have no doubt is because I believe with all my heart and soul in the kind of God that brought man onto this earth, not that he might be mocked with self-destruction, but that he might find resources in his mind and soul to believe there is a way out of whatever difficulties and dangers may arise. I believe God has made the soul and spirit of men even in death stronger than anything else in the whole world. This is and must be our ultimate resource. It cannot and will not fail.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a paper on taxation by Mr. John F. Selle, of Gainesville, Fla.; and in another place to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a short article from the Bricklayers Union Journal and a letter from Mr. Harry Stevenson, president of the International Molders and Foundry Workers Union of Cincinnati, Ohio.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AUTOMOBILE DEALERS AND FINANCE COMPANIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House previously made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Certainly.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and insert a letter sent to the New York Times by James G. McDonald, a member of the Board of Education of New York, and also an editorial on the same subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AUTOMOBILE DEALERS AND FINANCE COMPANIES

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I asked unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to inform the House of what is going on in my State in regard to finance companies, and I am sure the same thing is going on in other States. One minute was not sufficient time, and that is the reason I have asked more time. The gentleman from Florida, Congressman PETERSON, and all members of the Florida delegation have been cooperating with me in this matter. When I was down in Florida invariably when I ran into a small automobile agent or dealer I was told of the trouble that they were having with the finance companies, and I wondered at that time why we had not heard of this trouble before, but it is clear to me now. At the time I discussed the matter with them I wired to Mr. Donald Nelson and Mr. Leon Henderson and told them something must be done to relieve these automobile dealers, and that it must be done at once. I got a reply wire back, which went to Florida and came up here, and came to me after I got back from Florida. The wire came from Mr. Cyrus McCormick, in the Office of Price Administrator. This is the wire I received:

Please supply detailed information regarding finance companies demanding interest and principal. Have heard this frequently suggested, but never proved.

At first the wire offended me, but I thought for a little while, and I came to the conclusion that the reason it has never been proved is because the finance companies are a little too shrewd. I want to repeat something I said earlier in the day, and that is that the Government has frozen the sales of automobiles. Dealers can sell these automobiles only to certain people, and sometimes those people have cars already, and many of our small dealers, the ones that you and I represent, the men who hold maybe 15 to 25 automobiles, are unable to sell any of their cars. To give you a little information as to how these finance companies operate, I want to read a statement. First, let me say that I know these things to be true, and I challenge anyone to contradict it, including the finance companies, because they cannot do it. Some of those companies have been fair and I am not condemning them. And I would like to name the companies which have been unfair in the State of Florida, but, if I did so, they would know immediately who gave that information, and the dealers are afraid to say anything

about it publicly, because they know they are at the mercy of these finance companies. So I asked for a statement, and here is how they operate:

When a dealer buys a new car from the factory, the finance companies pay the factory, and the dealer gives the finance company a demand note or sometimes a 90-day note, and a time trust receipt. It has been the practice in normal times for the dealer to reduce the amount of the notes every 90 days, or 6 months, or according to the particular finance company he was doing business with. This practice was all right, when the times were normal and there was a steady flow of business. The cars moved right out, and there was not much chance of having to reduce these notes. Now, however, under the Government freeze order, and the fact that through the rationing program the cars are not being sold, the finance companies are requiring the dealers to pay interest on these notes, and some companies are requiring reduction on the notes or additional principal payments. These things, of course, work a hardship on the dealers as many of us do not have the cash to meet these requirements, and yet if we do not, naturally we can have the cars taken away from us under the terms of the notes and trust receipts and in many instances dealers have invested considerable cash in the cars, and the finance companies would benefit by selling the cars eventually and realizing on the full price of the car.

The dealers do not want anyone to lose anything. They do, however, feel that the finance companies should be required to stay the collection of principal payments and interest on these notes because the sale of the cars has been materially restricted under Government orders, and a dealer who did sell them to meet the finance company requirements would be violating the law. It seems only fair that the finance companies who, in the past, have profited greatly through the dealers' efforts should be required by the Government to cease their demands until the cars can be sold and not harass dealers.

I believe that you and I agree with them in that.

Many dealers stocked up with new cars late last fall in anticipation of the curtailment of new-car production, not expecting a stop order by the Government, and these cars are now on the dealers' showrooms and have been there long enough for the maturity dates to be coming close, so you can see why we are just beginning to hear from them. That is the reason for the necessity of immediate remedial action on someone's part.

The requirement that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation can purchase cars from dealers when such cars were bought after January 16, 1942, does not help one particle, because most of the cars were on dealers' showrooms before that time. They are new 1942 cars and cannot be sold except to essential users and there are very few of them able to buy. The dealers have expressed themselves many times that they are willing to sacrifice to help in the war effort, but they are not willing for the rich finance companies to take advantage of the situation and bleed the dealers for cash that they will sorely need later on in order to keep their doors open, just because the finance companies have the legal right to do so.

I agree that they should not do it.

It is one thing to tell a person that they cannot sell their merchandise which brings

them their bread and butter, and still ask them to pay moneys on that merchandise, but it would be a better thing to tell these finance companies that they, too, must wait and share the burden. After all they are still making profits from the retail contracts that the dealers sell to them on the used cars that they sell.

Now, the reason this matter has not come to our attention, the reason Mr. McCormick cannot get proof of it is because those finance companies are smart enough that they will not write one of these dealers and tell him, "You pay the interest and curtailment and the flat charge that they make or we will come in and take your automobile away." If they write to one of the dealers, they simply make a very fair proposition to him, and then they come around and tell him personally, "We can take these cars. We do not have to go through a court process, so you had better come across and do what we want you to do."

I have here a letter in my hand. I am not going to read it, because it would disclose who it came from to the finance company and get him into trouble, but it is a letter in which they absolutely demand a larger payment than he is possibly able to make under present conditions.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. They tell him in his letter, they say, "After you have made this payment, then we might do something to help you out, but you have first got to make the payment." They are going to the dealers and saying, "We are going to liquidate our business." In other words, what they are actually saying to them is, "We are going to close shop and we are going to have these payments, and if it is necessary for us to take the automobile on which you have made large payments already upon which you have paid interest, upon which you have accumulated overhead, unless you pay us we are going to take those cars."

What they are planning to do is to take those automobiles and sell them at a large profit.

Let me go a little further. I could give you a great deal of information along this line, and when the proper time comes I will do it, and I will get witnesses who are not afraid to testify, but some action must be taken, because the responsibility is on all of us. When the Government made this freezing order and stopped their sale, then the Government had another responsibility, and that was to see that the finance companies did not profit by this act.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does not the gentleman feel that this is a place where we should see to it that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or some other agency should be in a posi-

tion to step in and save some of these men?

Mr. HENDRICKS. The gentleman is absolutely correct. In addition, let me tell you something further which they are doing. Take Frigidaire and almost all those companies producing electric refrigerators, and many other small businesses. They are financed by these finance companies, and they are doing the same thing to them. We are going to have to have legislation in that regard.

I will tell you something further that I have from the inside, and that is that when we started this war program the President wanted to encourage existing finance companies to finance as far as possible, and they have financed some of the war contracts; but today they are retarding those contracts because they want to run things as they like and not as we would like to have them run. This is entirely wrong, and if they do not do something to correct the thing, I shall be willing to bring in an investigating resolution to investigate every one of them that has anything to do with a war contract. I think they will be glad to cooperate before we get through with them.

In regard to what the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] said, if he is still present I want to say I have introduced a bill today because I know that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation does not have the proper authority at the present time, I have introduced a bill today to permit the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to lend these dealers that amount of money which is necessary to protect their equity over whatever period is necessary; and when they do that they are immediately subrogated to the rights of these finance companies. They do not have to say, "If you are willing to sell this paper we will buy it"; they can give these dealers a check and they can take paper up. I think it is a bill that ought to be passed, because it is the only way we are going to help these dealers unless the Government comes in and absorbs every one of these automobiles.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In other words the Government says to these dealers: "You cannot sell your cars except at a certain time and only to certain people;" yet their cost, overhead, and wages are going on all the time.

Mr. HENDRICKS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And there ought to be machinery whereby they should not be exposed to the danger of being put into bankruptcy or failure during that period.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Absolutely, and the organization that we would not want to profiteer because of some war order is the finance company, because we know they make their money all the time, and they are doing exactly what the gentleman says.

I hope the committee to which this bill is referred will give us some prompt

action, because something must be done and I am going to insist on it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include therein an address by the Resident Commissioner of the Philippines [Mr. ELIZALDE] before the Amen Corner Club of Pittsburgh.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to revise and extend the remarks he made today and to insert therein certain excerpts from letters and statements as to the checks he received for the speeches he referred to in his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include therein a letter from one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on Thursday, April 9, 1942, present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 263. Joint resolution to provide decorations for outstanding conduct or service by persons serving in the American merchant marine.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 14, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, April 14, 1942. Business to be considered: Hearings along the line of the Sanders bill, H. R. 5497, and other matters connected with the Federal Communications Commission.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs at 10:30 a. m., Tuesday, April 14, 1942, in room 1310, House Office Building. Business to be considered: Hearings on S. 2025, to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, April 23, 1942, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 6885, to aid in the prosecution of the war effort by providing for the temporary suspension of the operation of State laws imposing restrictions with respect to menhaden fishing.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1562. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 1, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination, of the Tensas River, La., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1563. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to prescribe the pay and certain allowances for cadets of the United States Military Academy undergoing flight training and aviation instruction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1564. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Eileen Collins Tracy; to the Committee on Claims.

1565. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to \$5,420,000, and proposed provisions relative to the same appropriation, in the form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 697); to the Committee on Appropriations; and ordered to be printed.

1566. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers for his disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1567. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to the State of Missouri for highway purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1568. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, amounting to \$1,500,000 for the fiscal year 1942 and 1943 (H. Doc. No. 698); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 6818. A bill authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1995). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

House Report No. 1996. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1997. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEITER:

H. R. 6917 A bill to extend the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act to certain persons, and to the widows, children, and dependents of certain persons, injured while performing duty as firemen on property under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 6918 A bill for the relief of distributors, agents, and dealers of automobiles, motor trucks, and other motor vehicles; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 6919 A bill to amend the Judicial Code by adding thereto new sections authorizing authorized agents of the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department, or of the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department, or of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, to intercept, listen in on, or record telephone, telegraph, cable, radio or any other similar messages or communications, and the testimony concerning same admissible evidence; requiring telegraph and cable companies to furnish such agencies with copies of communications in their possession or under their possession or under their control upon request; providing punishment for violations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 6920 A bill to remove the requirement of a fee for the payment of a money order at an office other than that on which the order is drawn; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 6921 A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to authorize payments in cases where farmers' crops are acquired, prior to harvest, in connection with the acquisition of their farms for use in the national war effort, and to provide for the division of such payments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 6922. A bill for the relief of Mrs. August McCall; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 6923. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ada F. Ogle; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHERIDAN:

H. R. 6924. A bill for the relief of Joseph F. Gordon; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6925. A bill to provide additional compensation for Joseph Sharfsin, esquire, for professional services rendered the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2662. By Mr. HOPE: Petition urging the Federal Government to take action to prevent the giving or dispensing of alcoholic liquors to soldiers or sailors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2663. By Mr. KEOGH: Memorial of the Assembly of the Legislature of the State of New York, providing for the enactment of House bill 6806; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2664. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of the local federation No. 92, of Federated Shop Crafts members, protesting against the enactment of the so-called Smith, Boren, and Wickersham bills, and urging retention of labor laws now existing; to the Committee on Labor.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Thou O Eternal God, who are the Judge and Supreme Ruler of the Universe, we pray that Thou wilt inspire us with a clear vision of Thy holy will and a cheerful obedience to Thy laws.

We humbly confess that again and again we follow the desires of our own hearts, placing our confidence in human ingenuity and material strength apart from Thee. Grant that when Thy judgments are upon the earth the inhabitants thereof may learn righteousness and obedience.

In all the difficult experiences of life may we never give ourselves over to bitter rebellion and sullen resignation, but help us to sing the songs of hope and of high resolve and endeavor, confident that Thou wilt lead us out of darkness into the dawn of a better day.

We pray that the purposes and plans of these Thy servants and all whom Thou hast called to positions of trust and leadership in the life of our Republic may be filled with that wisdom which cometh from above. May the glory, through Jesus Christ, our Lord, be Thine forever and ever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE LATE S. FORRY LAUCKS

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HAINES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to announce the death of one of the finest gentlemen it has ever been my privilege to know. Mr. S. Forry Laucks, of York, Pa., an industrial leader of much importance to the Nation, one who was beloved by his employees and who join me today in expressing deep